

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

**FILED**

07-23-07  
04:15 PM

July 23, 2007

Agenda ID #6846  
Quasi-legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING (R.) 05-04-005 and R.98-07-038

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Rachelle Chong. It will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov).

Comments must be filed either electronically pursuant to Resolution ALJ-188 or with the Commission's Docket Office. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Steven Kotz at [kot@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:kot@cpuc.ca.gov) and Commissioner Chong's advisor Jane Whang at [jjw@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:jjw@cpuc.ca.gov). The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov).

/s/ ANGELA K. MINKIN  
Angela K. Minkin, Chief  
Administrative Law Judge

ANG:rbg

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER CHONG**  
(Mailed 7/23/2007)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the  
Commission's Own Motion to Assess and  
Revise the Regulation of  
Telecommunications Utilities.

Rulemaking 05-04-005  
(Filed April 7, 2005)

Rulemaking for the Purposes of Revising  
General Order 96-A Regarding Informal  
Filings at the Commission.

Rulemaking 98-07-038  
(Filed July 23, 1998)

**OPINION CONSOLIDATING PROCEEDINGS, CLARIFYING RULES  
FOR ADVICE LETTERS UNDER THE UNIFORM REGULATORY  
FRAMEWORK, AND ADOPTING PROCEDURES FOR DETARIFFING**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
OPINION CONSOLIDATING PROCEEDINGS, CLARIFYING RULES FOR ADVICE LETTERS UNDER THE UNIFORM REGULATORY FRAMEWORK, AND ADOPTING PROCEDURES FOR DETARIFFING.....	1
1. Overview .....	2
2. Procedural History .....	8
3. Discussion.....	14
3.1. Modifying and Clarifying Rules for URF Advice Letters .....	14
3.1.1. Rationale for One Day Effective Filing .....	15
3.1.2. Applying Existing Procedures to URF Advice Letters.....	17
3.1.3. Protesting URF Advice Letters Under GO 96-B .....	21
3.1.4. Response to Comments by Carriers .....	24
3.1.5. Response to Comments by Consumer Advocates .....	26
4. Detariffing Services Other than Basic Service.....	30
4.1. Positions of the Parties.....	30
4.1.1. Verizon.....	30
4.1.2. Pacific Bell .....	31
4.1.3. Sprint Nextel .....	31
4.1.4. Cox.....	31
4.1.5. SureWest.....	32
4.1.6. Frontier .....	33
4.1.7. Time Warner .....	33
4.1.8. DRA.....	33
4.1.9. TURN .....	35
4.2. The Criteria of Section 495.7 Have Been Met .....	37
4.2.1. The Commission Has Found that the AT&T, Verizon, SureWest and Frontier Lack Significant Market Power (Section 495.7(b)(1) is Satisfied).....	39
4.2.2. The Requirements of Sections 495.7(c) and (d) Have Also Been Met .....	45
4.3. Permissive Detariffing Procedure .....	49
4.4. Services That May Not be Detariffed Under Tier 2 Advice Letter.....	54
4.4.1. Exception: Basic Service .....	54
4.4.2. Exception: Asymmetric Obligations/Tariffs incorporating penalties or merger conditions.....	55

**TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(Cont'd)**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.4.3. Other Exceptions .....	58
4.5. Additional Comments on Discrete Detariffing Issues Not Subject to Page Limitations .....	59
4.6. Responses to Specific Comments .....	60
5. AT&T's Advice Letters .....	62
6. Assignment of Proceeding .....	63
7. Comments on Proposed Decision.....	63
Findings of Fact .....	64
Conclusions of Law .....	69
ORDER .....	73
Appendix A – Summary of Types of Advice Letter and Other Filings Approved in This Decision	

**OPINION CONSOLIDATING PROCEEDINGS, CLARIFYING RULES  
FOR ADVICE LETTERS UNDER THE UNIFORM REGULATORY  
FRAMEWORK, AND ADOPTING PROCEDURES FOR DETARIFFING**

**1. Overview**

We consolidate the two rulemaking proceedings docketed above to coordinate issues that overlap between the Uniform Regulatory Framework proceeding (“URF”) (R.05-04-005) and the General Order (“GO”) 96-B proceeding (R.98-07-038). This decision clarifies advice letter procedures and establishes detariffing requirements for carriers subject to the URF rules (URF Carriers).<sup>1</sup> We are adopting a companion decision establishing the Telecommunications Industry Rules as part of GO 96-B, which relies on the URF record<sup>2</sup> and incorporates the new advice letter and detariffing requirements that we adopt here.

In this decision, we address a portion of the issues that were raised in our URF proceeding’s Decision D.06-08-030 (URF Phase I decision), as modified by D.06-12-044, and in subsequent scoping memo, and deferred to this Phase II of the URF proceeding.<sup>3</sup>

1. Whether to detariff telephone service other than basic exchange service.
2. Implementation of URF Phase I decision and issues pertaining to rehearing in D.06-12-044:

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for a summary of the filing requirements we establish in this decision.

<sup>2</sup> R.98-07-038 concerns the procedures for the handling of informal filings at the Commission. Some informal filings, namely, advice letters, are subject to review and approval or rejection.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g. Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling and Revised Scoping Memo (Dec. 21, 2006).

- a. Clarifying the relationship between one-day-effective advice letters and the notice and protest requirements of General Order 96(a) and the Public Utilities Code, as well as prior Commission decisions, and determination of which subjects should fall under the tiers of GO 96 draft 2001 Telecommunications Industry Rules.
- b. Clarifying the scope of the asymmetric administrative processes language of Ordering Para. 21 of the URF Phase I decision .
- c. Assessing whether company-specific marketing and disclosure requirements imposed as a condition or requirement resulting from an enforcement or complaint case should be continued, or whether, in light of changed market conditions, they may be lifted through the filing of an advice letter.

There remain other issues that we will address in the next decision in Phase II.

We will address below first the procedures and guidelines for advice letter filings for tariffed services by URF Carriers. We have considered parties' comments and the existing rules under GO 96. We hereby modify our one-day effective filing rule for the following types of advice letter filings so that they may instead be *effective on the day of filing* (or another day that the URF Carrier chooses), pending disposition pursuant to GO 96-B, General Rule 7.3.3:<sup>4</sup>

- All tariff changes to retail service offerings other than basic service ;
- promotional offerings, bundles, new services; and

---

<sup>4</sup> As discussed further below and in the companion decision we adopt today establishing the Telecommunications Industry Rules, such filings would fall under Tier 1 of the industry rules.

- withdrawal of services other than basic residential (1MR and 1FR) and basic business (1MB) services where withdrawal of service would raise public safety issues.<sup>5</sup>

These advice letter filings by URF Carriers (“URF advice letters”) may be protested within 20 days of filing, but the grounds for protest are narrow, as provided in General Rule 7.4.2. If such a filing under General Rule 7.3.3 is protested, the advice letter *is not suspended*; if the staff or the Commission subsequently determines that the URF advice letter was incorrectly filed, the carrier will be required to take remedial actions regarding the filing. *See* General Rules 7.3.3 and 7.5.3.<sup>6</sup> We believe that Tier 1 procedures are consistent with, and promote, URF policies. To the extent that a carrier seeks to increase or reduce rates for basic service, the issue will be addressed in R.06-06-028, and the Commission will direct parties in that proceeding as to the appropriate method for filing any such changes.

We next explain below our decision to establish voluntary detariffing procedures for URF Carriers in this decision pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7. We find that the elements of Section 495.7 have been met and that we have the legal authority to establish detariffing procedures. The URF Phase 1 record established that, as required by Section 495.7(b)(1), the telephone corporations operating in the territories of Verizon, AT&T, Frontier, and SureWest lack significant market power. There are also existing sufficient

---

<sup>5</sup> *See* D.06-08-030 at Ordering Para. 9. The withdrawal of basic service and/or withdrawal of service as a carrier of last resort requires an application, pursuant to D.06-10-021 and D.96-10-066 respectively.

<sup>6</sup> In our companion decision, we revise our 2001 draft Telecommunications Industry Rules so that these types of URF advice letters may be filed under “Tier 1” treatment in GO 96-B.

safeguards and Commission consumer protection rules in place to satisfy the requirements of Section 495.7(c); however, we adopt in this decision new rules governing availability of rates, terms, and conditions and notices to customers for URF Carriers that detariff their services in further satisfaction of Section 495.7(c).

Because we have deregulated pricing of telecommunications services other than basic residential service (which rates are capped until January 2009), the issue of improper cross-subsidization under Section 495.7(d) does not exist. The Commission found that price floors are unnecessary in URF Phase I,<sup>7</sup> and thus, anti-competitive pricing behavior under Section 495.7(d) is unlikely to occur. Because pricing of wholesale or resale services remains subject to regulation<sup>8</sup> and we will require all carriers, at all times and without charge, to webpublish and also provide without charge via request to a tollfree number the applicable retail rates, charges, terms and conditions for any service available to the public on a detariffed basis, URF carriers will not be able to engage in anti-competitive or discriminatory pricing without detection.

For the reasons set out in Section 6 below, we decline to order mandatory detariffing. We also reject comments that urge us to impose specific disclosures or contract terms on carriers that choose to detariff a service. We establish permissive detariffing procedures in this decision for URF carriers to seek to detariff via advice letter within the next 18 months from the effective date of this decision any presently filed retail tariff except for:

---

<sup>7</sup> D.06-08-030 at 183-84.

<sup>8</sup> We noted in D.06-08-030 that wholesale services are not within the scope of this proceeding. See D.06-08-030 at 132.

- (a) a tariff for basic service;
- (b) a tariff that includes requirements, provisions, or conditions imposed in an enforcement, complaint, or merger proceeding;
- (c) a tariff for 9-1-1 or other emergency services;
- (d) a tariff relating to customer direct access to an interexchange carrier or customer choice of an interexchange carrier;
- (e) a tariff for a service that was not granted full pricing flexibility in Decision 06-08-030 (e.g., resale services); or
- (f) a tariff containing obligations as a Carrier of Last Resort, and other obligations under state and federal law.

Advice letters filed to detariff in compliance with this decision shall be treated as “Tier 2” advice letters under the Telecommunications Industry Rules that we adopt today in our companion decision, and shall be effective following staff review and approval, as provided for in General Order 96-B. *See* GO 96-B, General Rule 7.3.4. We intend for these detariffing procedures to apply for all URF Carriers, including the four major ILECs, competitive local exchange carriers (“CLECs”), and interexchange carriers (“IXCs”).

In submitting the advice letter to detariff, the carrier must list the tariff pages and describe services that it is detariffing so that the Commission may understand the categories or types of services that the carrier is seeking to detariff. Furthermore, if an URF Carrier seeks to offer on a detariffed basis a “new service,”<sup>9</sup> the carrier may offer the new service as detariffed, if the new

---

<sup>9</sup> We define “new service” as a service that is distinguished from any existing service offered by a telecommunications carrier by virtue of the technology employed and/or features, functions, and means of access provided. *See also* Rule 1.8 of the

*Footnote continued on next page*

service does not fall into the categories of services for which we prohibit detariffing. We will not apply the 18 month implementation period to “new services,” as technological innovations will continue to result in new services that we cannot anticipate at this time and which should not be subject to traditional forms of regulation. It is consistent with our detariffing policy and our findings in Phase I of the URF proceeding to allow carriers to file “new services” as detariffed on an informal, informational basis pursuant to General Rule 6.1 of GO 96-B. However, if the carrier seeks to offer the “new service” on a tariffed basis under Tier 1, the carrier may do so.

Parties have been given full notice and opportunity to be heard on all issues surrounding detariffing. However, as discussed below, to the extent that they have not already done so, parties may comment on policy issues relating to detariffing and for that purpose, we waive the page and content limitations under Rule 14.3 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. We also will waive the page and content limitation to allow parties to comment on whether the detariffing procedures that we establish here should apply to IXC's, in addition to CLECs and the four major ILECs. In all other aspects, parties must comply with the page and content restrictions under Rule 14.3 for commenting on proposed decisions.

We clarify Ordering Paragraph 21 of D.06-08-030, and find that the paragraph was intended to permit carriers to file advice letters removing certain asymmetrical marketing, disclosure, and administrative requirements, as long as such requirements did not, among other things, pertain to basic service, or were

---

Telecommunications Industry Rules (Appendix B to companion General Order 96-B decision).

not requirements imposed on a carrier as a result of an enforcement, complaint, or merger proceeding. Accordingly, we conclude that on a prospective basis, carriers may not remove such asymmetric requirements through an advice letter filing and must file a petition to modify the underlying decision that imposed such condition or requirement.

We will resolve the issues raised by protests to AT&T advice letters 28800 and 28982 in the next decision in this Phase II of the URF proceeding. TURN asserts that evidentiary hearings are required on issues that it alleges are material to the disposition<sup>10</sup> of the issues and we will address that request in a ruling shortly.

## **2. Procedural History**

The URF Rulemaking (R.) 05-04-005 is the latest of a series of proceedings in which the Commission has overhauled its regulation of the telecommunications industry. The goal of the current rulemaking is, to the highest degree possible, to establish a Uniform Regulatory Framework compatible with today's richly competitive marketplace for advanced telecommunications services.

In D.06-08-030, which concluded Phase I of the URF Rulemaking (the URF Phase I decision ), we granted carriers broad pricing freedoms concerning many telecommunications services, new telecommunications products, bundles of services, promotion, and contracts. We made contracts effective when executed, and ended the necessity of post-signing reviews by this Commission. With few

---

<sup>10</sup> See TURN Comments on Phase 2 (March 7, 2007) at 31.

restrictions, we permitted carriers to add services to “bundles” and target services to specific geographic markets.

We also capped the price of basic residential service until January 1, 2009 and froze rates of basic residential services receiving a California High Cost Fund-B (CHCF-B) subsidy at a level equal to the current rate pending the outcome of R. 06-06-028.

We reduced and eliminated many of the vestiges of rate-of-return regulation, such as “accounting adjustments” and other rules that cause regulatory accounts to diverge from financial accounts, electing to base our requirements on Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) accounting standards and FCC accounting rules. We eliminated the price cap index, price cap filings, earnings “sharing,” and gain-on-sale distributions.

With the exception of conditions relating to basic residential rates, pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 21 we eliminated all asymmetric requirements concerning marketing, disclosure, or administrative procedures.<sup>11</sup>

Although we required all carriers to provide a thirty-day notice to customers of any price increase or more restrictive term or condition, we simplified all tariff procedures and made tariffs effective one day after filing.<sup>12</sup> We eliminated all monitoring reports tied to the supplanted New Regulatory Framework (NRF) and standardized our reporting requirements to make them consistent with comprehensive reports provided by all carriers to the FCC.

---

<sup>11</sup> D.06-08-030, at Ordering Para. 21.

<sup>12</sup> However, we modify below in this decision the one-day effective filing for URF Carriers’ advice letters that we adopted in D.06-08-030.

We set Phase II for determining what reports we should require carriers to file under URF and we asked parties to recommend reports that will assist us in carrying out our statutory duties and exercising regulatory oversight.<sup>13</sup>

We also ordered a separate briefing cycle to consider whether we should altogether detariff telecommunications services other than basic residential service and left the decision of that question to this Phase.<sup>14</sup> We referred all service quality issues to R.02-12-004, the Service Quality rulemaking, and issues relating to the Deaf and Disabled Telecommunications Program to R.06-05-028, our Universal Service rulemaking on public policy programs. We deferred the consideration of special access pricing to Phase II.

On September 25, 2006, nine parties filed opening briefs limited to detariffing issues.<sup>15</sup> On October 13, 2006, eight parties filed reply briefs.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> See Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and Revised Scoping Memo (dated December 21, 2006) at 3-5.

<sup>14</sup> D.06-08-030, Ordering Para. 10 Assigned Commissioner Ruling and Revised Scoping Memo (Dec. 21, 2006) at 3.

<sup>15</sup> AT&T, Verizon, SureWest, Frontier, Cox, DRA, TURN, Sprint/Nextel, and Time Warner filed opening comments. Some parties like Verizon submitted "briefs" while others like Pacific Bell submitted "comments." TURN (*see* "Positions of the Parties," below) argues that the evidentiary record lacks the findings necessary to support detariffing under Section 495.7 and this insufficiency is worsened by requesting briefs instead of comments on the issue of detariffing in the Phase I decision. As we stated in D.06-12-044, the URF Phase 1 decision uses the terms "briefs" and "comments" interchangeably, but our use of the term "brief" did not mean that we would not consider the filings as part of the entire record. We clarified in D.06-12-044 that the briefs would be treated as comments. D.06-12-044 at Ordering Para. 1.m. We further noted in the Phase I decision that we would consider "whether we should altogether detariff telecommunications services other than basic residential service" and a separate cycle was established precisely to give parties the opportunity to comment on this issue.

*Footnote continued on next page*

On September 11, 2006, soon after the issuance of the URF Phase I decision and relying on Ordering Paragraph 21 of D.06-08-030, AT&T filed Advice Letter 28800 that eliminated many of the disclosure requirements that we had imposed on it through a 2001 decision<sup>17</sup> in an enforcement case in C.98-04-004 as corrective actions and as remedy for certain marketing abuses.<sup>18</sup> Protests were filed to this advice letter by DRA, TURN, the Utility Consumers' Action Network ("UCAN"), Latino Issues Forum ("LIF"), and Centro La Familia, and subsequently on October 23, 2006, AT&T filed advice letter 28982, which added back some but not all of the preexisting disclosure language to Rule 12 of its tariffs. The basis for AT&T's filing of these advice letters was the company's determination that such corrective actions were "asymmetric requirements" of the type eliminated by Ordering Paragraph 21 of the URF Phase I decision. Protests were also filed to AT&T's advice letter 28982. In response to protests to those advice letters, we issued Resolution No. L-339 in November 2006, which ordered that AT&T's tariff changes in these advice letters shall remain in effect, pending resolution of the issues raised in the protests.<sup>19</sup> We also stated in Resolution No. L-339 that we would address issues raised by the protests to AT&T's advice letters in Phase II

---

D.06-08-030 at 3. Accordingly, we reject parties' arguments that the "briefing cycle" was insufficient.

<sup>16</sup> These parties were AT&T, Verizon, SureWest, Frontier, Cox, DRA, TURN, and Department of Defense.

<sup>17</sup> D. 01-09-058.

<sup>18</sup> See Resolution No. L-339 (discussing AT&T's Advice Letters 28800 and 28982). The Commission was not informed that AT&T's Advice Letter 28800 removed language from AT&T's Tariff Rule 12 resulting from an enforcement case when Advice Letter 28800 was filed.

<sup>19</sup> See Resolution L-399 Ordering Paras. 1 and 2.

of the URF proceeding and served this resolution on all parties in the URF proceeding and parties in the consolidated complaint case (C.98-04-004).

On September 29, 2006, TURN and DRA had filed a Joint Application for Rehearing of D.06-08-030, alleging multiple instances of legal error. After careful consideration of the TURN/DRA application, we issued D.06-12-044, which granted limited rehearing on the issues regarding Ordering Paragraph 21 and its elimination of asymmetric marketing, disclosure, and administrative requirements. In D.06-12-044, we prospectively suspended the effectiveness of Ordering Paragraph 21 pending resolution of those issues in Phase II of this proceeding. We noted that we would include in this phase an examination of whether company-specific disclosure and marketing requirements imposed as a penalty or corrective action in a complaint or investigation should be continued, or whether, in light of changed market conditions, they may be lifted in response to the filing of an advice letter.<sup>20</sup> We also noted that we had included in this phase resolution of those issues raised by the protests to AT&T's advice letters 28800 and 28892.<sup>21</sup>

Furthermore, at our November 2006 prehearing conference in Phase II of the URF rulemaking, a key issue raised for consideration was the appropriate timeframe (and rules) for protests to and suspension of advice letters authorized in URF Phase I. TURN and DRA specifically questioned whether the protest process relating to one-day effective advice letter requires more specificity for the

---

<sup>20</sup> D.06-12-044 at Ordering Para. 2.

<sup>21</sup> D.06-12-044 at 30.

staff to implement.<sup>22</sup> We acknowledged that parties may need further guidance on the issue.<sup>23</sup> We sought comment on the relationship between one-day effective advice letters and the notice and protest requirements of GO 96-A and the Public Utilities Code and prior Commission decisions.<sup>24</sup>

On December 21, 2006, the Assigned Commissioner issued a revised Scoping Memo seeking comment on among other things, the issues highlighted above, and a proposed schedule for this phase of the proceeding. Pursuant to the Scoping Memo, the assigned ALJ held a Workshop on February 16, 2007 to discuss whether the Commission should require any new or reinstated reports in place of the NRF-specific reports eliminated in Phase I or whether we could rely entirely on the FCC ARMIS reports. On March 2, 2007, parties submitted opening comments on Phase II issues other than detariffing, and on March 30, 2007, they submitted reply comments.

We have bifurcated this Phase II decision into the present decision, addressing advice letter procedures, detariffing, and asymmetric obligations, and will address the remainder of the Phase II issues identified in the Scoping Memo in a decision to be issued later this year.

---

<sup>22</sup> TURN Opening Brief at 2, and DRA Reply Brief at 9.

<sup>23</sup> D.06-12-044, at 31.

<sup>24</sup> Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and Revised Scoping Memo (December 21, 2006) at 4.

### **3. Discussion**

#### **3.1. Modifying and Clarifying Rules for URF Advice Letters**

After having considered the record, we modify in this section our existing one-day effective advice letter filing requirement and apply instead the Commission's existing protest timeframe set forth in GO 96(a), now subsumed into GO 96-B. *See* General Rule 7.4 of GO 96-B.<sup>25</sup> Specifically, we modify our requirement that URF advice letters are effective on one day after filing to "effective pending disposition" under GO 96-B's General Rule 7.3.3. Therefore, the following URF Carriers' advice letters shall be effective on the day of filing (or other requested date by carrier):<sup>26</sup>

- Changes to services other than basic service;<sup>27</sup>
- promotional offerings, bundles,<sup>28</sup> new services; and

---

<sup>25</sup> In General Rule 7.4, GO 96-B states that any person (including individuals, groups, or organizations) may protest or respond to an advice letter within 20 days of the date of filing of the advice letter. The grounds for protest are set forth in General Rule 7.4.2, and are narrow, as discussed further below.

<sup>26</sup> We will allow URF Carriers to file their advice letters under Tier 1 of the Telecommunications Industry Rules (adopted today in R.98-07-038), but if the carrier chooses to file its advice letter under Tier 2, it may do so at its discretion, in order to obtain prior Commission staff authorization before taking a particular action other than one mandated by statute or Commission order.

<sup>27</sup> D.06-08-030 requires 30-day notice to customers for rate increases, or more restrictive terms and conditions.

<sup>28</sup> Bundling generally refers to a combination of services that are packaged together for a single price. In our URF Phase I decision, we noted that "bundling" often refers to the "'triple play' sale of voice, data, and video in one package for a single price by major communications market participants, including telephone companies, cable providers, satellite service providers, wireless companies, BPL providers, and others." D.06-08-030 at 75, n.298.

- withdrawal of services other than basic residential (1MR and 1FR) and basic business (1MB) services where withdrawal of service would raise public safety issues.<sup>29</sup>

We will reflect this treatment as Tier 1 in the Telecommunications Industry Rules that we are adopting today in our companion decision. On or after October 1, 2007, URF Carriers shall file these types of advice letters under Tier 1. As for tariff changes to basic service, we are addressing basic service rates in R.06-06-028 and in that decision will address how such changes shall be filed with the Commission.

Protests may be filed to these advice letters during a 20-day protest timeframe under GO 96. Because in URF Phase I, we granted URF Carriers pricing flexibility for most services other than basic service, the grounds for protest of URF advice letters are more limited than for advice letters filed by traditionally regulated utilities. URF Carriers' advice letter filings are effective on the date of filing and are not suspended if protested, consistent with the language of General Rule 7.3.3 and 7.5.3. *See also* D.07-01-024. However, if the Commission or staff finds that the advice letters should not have been filed in Tier 1 or pursuant to General Rule 7.3.3, the carrier may be required to withdraw the filing and make refunds or other adjustments as the Commission may require. General Rule 7.3.3.

### **3.1.1. Rationale for One Day Effective Filing**

Before we explain our basis for applying GO 96-B to URF advice letter filings, we consider the reasons for why we adopted one-day effective filings in

---

<sup>29</sup> *See* D.06-08-030, at 202.

D.06-08-030. The most extensive discussion of our basis for the one-day effective filing is the following (from D.06-08-030 at *mimeo*. pp. 182-83):

In a fast-moving technology space like telecommunications, there is no public interest in maintaining an outmoded tariffing procedure that requires the burdensome regulatory review of cost data and delays the provision of services (particularly new or less expensive ones) to customers. This system only made sense in a world where there was a single dominant ILEC, and active regulatory intervention was required to protect consumers. Thus, it is reasonable that all advice letters for tariffed services should go into effect on a one-day filing.

We ordered in Ordering Paragraph 9 of the URF Phase I decision:

AT&T , Verizon, SureWest, and Frontier shall be authorized to allow all tariffs to go into effect on a one-day filing, but any tariffs that impose price increases or service restrictions shall require a thirty-day advance notice to all affected customers.

We granted similar flexible tariff filing procedures for CLECs in Ordering Paragraph 13.<sup>30</sup> What the above text reveals are the policies we hoped to advance by means of the one-day filing procedure. Among other things, we wanted to provide URF Carriers with the ability to innovate and offer new services or rates, terms, and conditions without regulatory delay. Furthermore, before we issued our URF Phase I decision, there were differing filing procedures for different carriers. Incumbent LECs were subject generally to a 30-day approval period, while CLECs were subject to expedited 5-day approvals for minor rate increases and 30 day approval periods for major rate increases.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> There are other fleeting mentions of “one-day filing,” notably Conclusions of Law 35, 40, 44, and 48, and Ordering Paragraph 12.

<sup>31</sup> See, e.g., D.95-07-054, Appendix A.

Accordingly, we attempted to create a more uniform filing procedure for URF Carriers but conditioned the increased flexibility granted to URF Carriers with customer notification requirements.

We acknowledge that there could have been more guidance in D.06-08-030 about the implementation and procedural requirements for “one-day filing.” We discuss in greater detail below our reasons for modifying our one-day effective filings for URF advice letters in this decision, and provide additional guidance on how the new rules will work.

### **3.1.2. Applying Existing Procedures to URF Advice Letters**

Although the Commission has previously established one-day effective advice letters in resolutions for specific carriers, reference to those individual decisions is not useful in the URF context as such precedent was adopted years ago by the Commission in the New Regulatory Framework (NRF) context and thus is outdated.<sup>32</sup> However, we do have established guidance on notice, suspension, and review of advice letters for telephone corporations in GO 96-A. These rules are to some extent now found in the Commission’s recently adopted GO 96-B, but GO 96-B also contains other revisions incorporating requirements adopted in different decisions over the years. We find that GO 96-B provides an adequate framework for URF advice letter filings. We also establish a few additional rules for treatment under Tier 1 for URF Carriers, which we discuss

---

<sup>32</sup> Commission precedent for “advice letter filings effective in one day without prior Commission approval” exists in Resolution (Res.) T-15139 (March 24, 1993). That resolution, the earliest of its type, authorized Pacific Bell to use this advice letter procedure for changes to certain Category III Services under the New Regulatory Framework.

below and will incorporate in our companion decision today adopting Telecommunications Industry Rules for GO 96-B.

GO 96-B provides an appropriate framework because it recognizes the emergence of alternative regulatory approaches at this Commission, and the greater flexibility we have accorded utility management in all the regulated industries. As we discussed in the URF Phase I decision, high levels of telecommunications competition compels us to relax outdated “command and control” style regulation in many areas. GO 96-B meets the changing needs of today’s regulatory environment. Under GO 96-B, there are three tiers of filings for advice letters, with different treatment:<sup>33</sup>

- Tier 1 advice letters are effective upon filing and are approved automatically within 30 days (“deemed approved”) if not protested. General Rule 7.3.3 of GO 96-B.
- Tier 2 advice letters are effective only after approval by staff, but if there is no protest and no action by the staff within 30 days, they are deemed approved, as in the case of Tier 1 advice letters. General Rule 7.3.4 of GO 96-B.
- Tier 3 advice letters are effective only after approval by Commission resolution (and cannot be deemed approved). General Rule 7.3.5 of GO 96-B.

Advice letters filed by URF Carriers qualify for inclusion in Tier 1 or Tier 2 because they concern matters over which the utility already has broad authority to take the proposed actions under applicable statutes or Commission orders.

---

<sup>33</sup> As discussed in our companion decision, our draft Telecommunications Industry Rules issued in 2001 also established three tiers of advice letter filings. We have revised the subjects falling under each of those tiers pursuant to D.06-08-030 and those are reflected in the Telecommunications Industry Rules we adopt today.

The job for the industry division staff in reviewing a Tier 1 or Tier 2 advice letter is ministerial: So long as the proposed action is squarely within the applicable statutes or Commission orders, it must be approved.<sup>34</sup> Accordingly, Tier 1 advice letters are especially suitable for partly or fully deregulated industries. In competitive conditions, market participants must be able to act quickly.<sup>35</sup>

When we approved the Tier 1 concept, we expressly endorsed its use in contexts similar to URF:

The main reason to allow many advice letters to go into effect pending disposition . . . is to better accommodate innovation and competition in the marketplace. According to some commenters, a utility that must publicly announce and then wait regulatory approval for a new product or service will often find that competitors are able to copy the program before the utility has had any significant chance to benefit from its initiative. As a result, the incentive to innovate is reduced, nominal competitors tend to “me too” each other so that prices move in lockstep, and any genuinely innovative advice letter is correspondingly more likely to elicit protests from competitors who hope to gain time to catch up with similar proposals of their own. By allowing certain types of advice letters to take effect before regulatory approval, we can fulfill our responsibilities while giving greater scope to market forces.

---

<sup>34</sup> Our later discussion of the grounds for protest regarding URF advice letters includes practical examples of how ministerial review works.

<sup>35</sup> Tier 1 procedures provide carriers flexibility because Tier 1 advice letters are effective upon filing, and because they are already in effect, they may not be suspended. (See D.07-01-024, *mimeo.* at 15.)

D.07-01-024, *mimeo.* p. 13 (emphasis in original). For the foregoing reasons, we believe that the existing rules under GO 96-B (e.g., General Rule 7.3.3 governing Tier 1 filings) are appropriate for the URF advice letters at issue.<sup>36</sup>

In addition, we note that there is no real benefit to have a one-day delay between filing and effectiveness. For example, in the absence of applying the general rules under GO 96-B, it is unclear whether, if a party files a protest to the one-day effective filing on the day of filing, the advice letter would then be suspended.

We find that there should be some safeguard (consistent with our review of GO 96 procedures and the precedents for advice letters becoming effective one day after filing) against filing of an advice letter that the Commission finds to be unlawful. Under GO 96-B, an advice letter that was not lawfully filed under the “effective pending disposition” Tier 1 category may be rejected and the carrier required to take remedial actions. The Tier 1 procedures also enable a utility to wholly mitigate any risk of rejection and consequent rescission by permitting the utility to submit an advice letter that would qualify for Tier 1 treatment to submit it nevertheless under Tier 2 (effective upon staff approval) so that the utility can obtain approval before implementing the advice letter.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> The customer notice requirements that we adopted in URF Phase I shall continue to apply to these URF advice letters.

<sup>37</sup> D.07-01-024, *mimeo.* at 14. In all likelihood, a utility will choose immediate effectiveness whenever possible. But there may be circumstances where the assurance of prior approval is desired. For example, if the utility is responding to a new statute, good faith questions of interpretation may arise. It seems consistent with URF policy to leave with utility management the choice between immediate effectiveness and prior approval.

### **3.1.3. Protesting URF Advice Letters Under GO 96-B**

We noted in the foregoing discussion of Tier 1 that GO 96-B states the grounds on which an advice letter may be protested. The specific grounds are as follows:

- (1) The utility did not properly serve or give notice of the advice letter;
- (2) The relief requested in the advice letter would violate statute or Commission order, or is not authorized by statute or Commission order on which the utility relies;
- (3) The analysis, calculations, or data in the advice letter contain material errors or omissions;
- (4) The relief requested in the advice letter is pending before the Commission in a formal proceeding;
- (5) The relief requested in the advice letter requires consideration in a formal hearing, or is otherwise inappropriate for the advice letter process; or
- (6) The relief requested in the advice letter is unjust, unreasonable, or discriminatory, provided that such a protest may not be made where it would require relitigating a prior order of the Commission.

*Id.*, General Rule 7.4.2.

The grounds for protest are even more narrow, where the Commission has determined, for example, not to regulate rates. General Rule 7.4.2 sets forth that protests may not object on policy grounds to an advice letter where the relief requested is consistent with rules or directions established by a Commission order. For example, GO 96-B sets forth in Example 2 that:

Where the Commission does not regulate the rates of specific type of utility, an advice letter submitting a rate change by a utility of the specified type is not subject to protest on the grounds that the rates are unjust, unreasonable, or discriminatory.

*Id.*, General Rule 7.4.2 (emphasis added). Accordingly, a protest could not challenge an URF Carrier's filed increased rates pursuant to Example 2 above.<sup>38</sup> We believe that the general rules of GO 96-B appropriately limit the grounds for baseless protests to advice letters and that staff's review of such protests should be relatively ministerial.<sup>39</sup>

Another ground for protest is that the advice letter would violate applicable law. The following list illustrates potential grounds for protest with regard to URF advice letters:

- An advice letter tendered under URF may be protested on the ground that it concerns subject matter expressly excluded or deferred from URF, such as service quality. (See D.06-08-030, Ordering Paragraph 17.)
- An advice letter tendered under URF may be protested on the ground that it unlawfully increases a rate for basic telephone service subject to pricing controls. (See Pub. Util. Code § 5950.)
- An advice letter tendered under URF may be protested on the ground that it would increase a rate for basic telephone

---

<sup>38</sup> Basic service or residential rates are still regulated by statute and Commission order; thus, advice letters changing residential rates may be protested for violating a cap or other limitation set by applicable law.

<sup>39</sup> As for the other grounds for protest, the first ground for protest concerns proper notice and service. Notice and service of advice letters are both covered under GO 96-B. (See General Rules 4.1 - 4.4.) Notice to customers under certain conditions such as rate increases or more restrictive terms and conditions is a major concern of URF; failure to follow the rules is an appropriate ground of protest to an URF advice letter. Defective notice may be cured, however, and an improperly noticed or served advice letter will be rejected without prejudice, as we discuss later in today's decision where we deal with the Telecommunications Industry Rules.

service in order to finance the cost of deploying a network to provide video service. (See Pub. Util. Code § 5940.)

These grounds are fairly narrow and result from the Commission's decisions and/or law. The first example reflects D.06-08-030 while the latter two examples reflect the requirements of the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006, Assembly 2987 (Ch. 700, Stats. 2006).<sup>40</sup> Therefore, with the light-handed regulatory policies we established in URF Phase I, protests of advice letters based on the purported lack of authority by the utility to take the proposed action should be far less frequent under URF than under the prior "New Regulatory Framework," not to mention traditional ratemaking. Further, staff should be able to discern whether a protest should be rejected easily or whether it merits further consideration.

However, in anticipation of cases where a protest of a Tier 1 URF advice letter raises issues that cannot be easily resolved by staff, we direct staff to notify the Director of the Communications Division within the initial 30-day period of review that the protest may require longer than 30 days to resolve, and thereafter, the staff shall report back on the status of the review of the protest every 30 days. The staff's goal should be to resolve the issue within 60 days. In certain cases, if staff has failed to resolve the issue, the Commission shall issue a resolution to decide the matter no later than 150 days after the date of filing of the advice letter.

With the above modifications that we adopt for the Telecommunications Industry Rules today in our companion decision, we find that GO 96-B procedures are well-suited to URF, and that the one-day filing procedure

adopted for advice letters in D.06-08-030 should be replaced by Tier 1 as set forth in D.07-01-024 (see General Rule 7.3.3) and adopted in our concurrent industry rules. Our consideration of the parties' comments on this issue, to which we now turn, confirms our view that Tier 1 treatment under GO 96-B should supplant one-day filing.

### **3.1.4. Response to Comments by Carriers**

Cox/Time Warner's comments support the approach that we have taken above of applying the GO 96-B rules and the different tiers of treatment for specific types of advice letters filed by URF Carriers. Specifically, Cox/Time Warner supports using Tier 1 for the range of URF advice letters that we considered initially for one-day effective advice letter filing.<sup>41</sup> As discussed, we believe that this approach best accommodates the policies of URF while providing guidelines for the advice letters.

The large local exchange carriers reject with little analysis the tier structure in GO 96-B. *See, e.g.,* Opening Comments of Pacific Bell Telephone Company on Phase 2 Issues (March 2, 2007) at p. 50 ("In fact, the tiers discussed in Rules 7.3.3, 7.3.4, and 7.3.5 are inconsistent with the URF Decision...."); Opening Comments of SureWest Telephone on Phase 2 Issues (March 2, 2007) at p. 21 (interpreting GO 96-B as deferring to the "supremacy" of D.06-08-030);<sup>42</sup> Reply Comments of

---

<sup>40</sup> Any increase to basic service will be addressed in R.06-06-028.

<sup>41</sup> *See* Cox/Time Warner Comments (March 2, 2007) at 1-2.

<sup>42</sup> GO 96-B does make provision for Commission orders authorizing "an advice letter to go into effect on a date different from that otherwise provided by these General Rules." *See* General Rule 7.3.1. GO 96-B accommodates one-day filing within its procedures for review and disposition of advice letters, even though its tier system does not include one-day filing. GO 96-B also accommodates unique statutory provisions, such as those

*Footnote continued on next page*

Verizon California Inc. and Its Certificated California Affiliates on All Phase 2 Issues Other than Detariffing (March 30, 2007) at pp. 8-10 (preferring the “streamlined advice letter process adopted in Phase 1” to the tiered structure of GO 96-B). Among other things, Verizon asserts advice letter tiers “would also undermine another key URF goal” – namely, “competitive neutrality” – because Voice-over-Internet Protocol (VoIP) and wireless carriers do not have to file advice letters to make tariff changes, in contrast to local and interexchange carriers. *Id.*, p. 9.

These carriers correctly identify streamlined process and competitive neutrality as among the goals of URF. However, they assume with virtually no analysis that one-day filing furthers those goals, while arguing that the tiered process of GO 96-B is inconsistent with URF. These arguments do not recognize that Tier 1 under GO 96-B would promote streamlined regulation, and in fact would permit advice letters to become effective upon filing. In general, these parties also offer no alternative guidelines for processing advice letters. Verizon only concedes that one-day effective advice letters may be protested for procedural reasons, but as we discuss above, there may be substantive reasons for protesting an URF advice letter under Tier 1 at this time (e.g., an URF Carrier may not submit an advice letter to increase basic service rates).<sup>43</sup>

---

regarding the effective date for advice letters that pertain to recycled water service (see Pub. Util. Code § 455.1) or oil pipeline rate changes (see Pub. Util. Code § 455.3). The need to encompass this great variety of effective dates was a prime motivation when we created a comprehensive manual for advice letter practice in GO 96-B. However, in light of our need to address other aspects of advice letters, including protest and disposition issues, we believe that the Tier 1 treatment is most consistent with URF policies and goals.

<sup>43</sup> See Verizon Comments on Phase 2 at 16.

Verizon's argument regarding competitive neutrality is unpersuasive. Verizon's concern does not pertain specifically to one-day filing versus Tier 1 procedures but rather pertains to advice letters in general. Many carriers, including Verizon, must file advice letters, while VoIP and wireless carriers do not file advice letters due to federal jurisdictional issues, and to that extent, they have a competitive advantage, regardless of GO 96-B.<sup>44</sup> Due to jurisdictional issues, the Commission cannot achieve perfect competitive neutrality with today's decision; that is not a realistic goal. But in URF and in other proceedings, such as the Consumer Protection Initiative, Universal Service, and California High Cost Fund B, the Commission is taking important steps toward competitive neutrality. First, under Tier 1, we allow URF advice letters to take effect immediately upon filing; there will be no time lag between filing and effectiveness and no possibility of suspension. This will allow URF carriers to respond to offerings of competitive local exchange carriers, wireless and VOIP carriers. Second, as discussed above, we have established procedures for detariffing of telecommunications services by advice letter via Tier 2 treatment.<sup>45</sup>

The small local exchange carriers continue to be subject to rate regulation.

### **3.1.5. Response to Comments by Consumer Advocates**

The Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) argues:

---

<sup>44</sup> This competitive disparity, however, results from federal preemption over certain aspects of VoIP and wireless service. The disparity does not result from any action taken in the URF or GO 96 rulemakings.

<sup>45</sup> "If the Commission does decide to approve detariffing of most services, the question of the effectiveness of most advice letters will become moot." Opening Comments of

*Footnote continued on next page*

Even a streamlined tariff regime would have to include some basic processes and details in order to be implemented in a coherent manner. Rather than attempting to craft unique tariff rules for telephone companies based on the sole principle established in the Phase 1 decision that all tariffs must be effective upon one day's notice, it makes more sense to adapt the [GO 96-B] framework to the regulatory needs of the telecommunications industry.

Comments of DRA on Phase 2 Issues (March 2, 2007) at p. 48. DRA's recommended adaptations to GO 96-B, however, would be inconsistent with our adopted URF policies.

DRA begins by recommending that URF tariffs be filed as Tier 1 advice letters (*id.* at p. 46). Then, however, DRA states that tariff changes that "impose price increases or service changes, or raise public safety issues, should be filed as Tier 2 advice letters...." (*id.* at p. 47, emphasis in original). This "exception" seems so broad as to swallow the rule. Moreover, and in apparent contradiction to GO 96-B, DRA emphasizes that Tier 1 advice letters would be subject to suspension until the end of the 30-day initial review period (*id.* at pp. 47-48).

We believe that GO 96-B's treatment of suspension for Tier 1 is consistent with our URF policies. Under GO 96-B, Tier 1 advice letters are not suspended (since they are effective pending disposition). We *retain* the power to reject an advice letter that is shown to be improperly designated at Tier 1 and to require appropriate remedial action by the carrier (see General Rule 7.5.3); what we have declined to do under Tier 1 is to suspend an already effective advice letter while we decide whether or not to reject it.<sup>46</sup> Without directly criticizing this aspect of

---

Cox California Telcom LLC on Phase 2 Issues (March 2, 2007) at 15. Cox supports Tier 1 treatment for most advice letter filings. *Id.*

<sup>46</sup> D.07-01-024 at 16.

GO 96-B, DRA cites to federal law and GO 96-A (soon to be superseded entirely by GO 96-B) as authority for DRA's preferred process for handling advice letter protests, suspensions, and revocations.

The reason the Commission must be able to suspend a tariff filing, according to DRA, is that "[r]egardless of the pricing flexibility granted to the four largest carriers in California, the Commission must still ensure that rates are just and reasonable."<sup>47</sup> This assertion by DRA suggests that DRA rejects or misunderstands the findings of our Phase 1 decision regarding the competitive telecommunications marketplace in California. In a competitive marketplace, the rates of the market participants are disciplined by each other's offerings. Moreover, even if there were a suspension procedure available, it could not be invoked to force the Commission to review rates that the Commission no longer regulates:

Where the Commission does not regulate the rates of a specific type of utility, an advice letter submitting a rate change by a utility of the specified type is not subject to protest on the grounds that the rates are unjust, unreasonable, or discriminatory.

GO 96-B, General Rule 7.4.2, Example 2. Thus, while DRA has recognized the need for URF advice letter procedures and the desirability of consistency with GO 96-B, DRA's recommendations are at odds with URF and GO 96-B on several important points.

The Utility Reform Network (TURN), like DRA, supports use of GO 96-B but would impose more restrictive review procedures on URF advice letters, which are inconsistent with our URF Phase I decision. TURN would make Tier 1

---

<sup>47</sup> DRA Comments on Phase 2, at 47, footnote omitted.

available to URF advice letters that “do not impose price increases or have the effect of increasing a rate or charge, impose a more restrictive term or condition or material change in service, involve matters of public safety or withdraw or grandfather a service....” Comments of The Utility Reform Network (March 2, 2007) at p. 19. For other advice letters, TURN proposes a “modified” Tier 2, under which the advice letter becomes effective one day after filing per the Phase 1 decision but is otherwise subject to protest and suspension per the Tier 2 procedures.<sup>48</sup>

Because TURN’s recommendations are very similar to DRA’s, we need not repeat our response here. However, there are certain assumptions DRA and TURN seem to share but that surface sharply in TURN’s arguments. For example, TURN defends its modified Tier 2 by saying “to the extent a carrier’s service is tariffed, there must be some meaningful review of changes to those tariffs.” Reply Comments of The Utility Reform Network (March 30, 2007) at p. 30. The statement is undeniably true, but what is “meaningful” logically relates to the kind of regulatory scrutiny required.

Due to new and vibrant competition, our regulation of the telecommunications industry has changed. In that context, we may and should question the usefulness of procedures, such as advice letter suspension, which DRA and TURN regard as critical to our procedures. We discussed above the reasons why the grounds for protest of URF advice letters should be narrow and why there should not be suspension of these advice letters. When we approved the Tier 1 procedure in D.07-01-024 adopting GO 96-B earlier this year, we also

---

<sup>48</sup> In contrast, under DRA’s Tier 2 proposal, DRA would require the URF utility to file its advice letter on the same day the utility gives notice to its customers.

rejected the possibility of suspension for Tier 1 filings generally,<sup>49</sup> and we see nothing in DRA's or TURN's arguments to convince us to do otherwise with URF advice letters.

#### **4. Detariffing Services Other than Basic Service**

##### **4.1. Positions of the Parties**

Today's decision on detariffing has considered, and combines, elements of comments and reply comments from many parties. We summarize the parties' positions below.

##### **4.1.1. Verizon**

Verizon submitted its detariffing proposal<sup>50</sup> on September 25, 2006, in the form of initial comments in response to our request for briefs on detariffing in the URF Phase I decision . Verizon's proposal contains four elements:

1. Permissive detariffing over an 18-month period using the one-day effective advice letter process adopted in the URF Phase I decision .<sup>51</sup>
2. Use of any binding agreement permissible under applicable law to replace tariffs.
3. Elimination of the contract filing requirement.
4. Public disclosure of generally available terms and conditions by any method permissible under applicable law.

---

<sup>49</sup> D.07-01-024 at 15.

<sup>50</sup> Opening Brief of Verizon California Inc. (U 1002 C) and its Certificated California Affiliates on Legal and Implementational Issues Associated with Detariffing (September 25, 2006)

<sup>51</sup> Verizon proposes that carriers be permitted to detariff on a service-by-service basis during an 18 month transition period.

Verizon urges us to permit detariffing of all services in this fashion except for basic residential service.

#### **4.1.2. Pacific Bell**

Pacific Bell's initial proposal<sup>52</sup> resembles Verizon's except that Pacific Bell also urges us to exempt 911 services from the permissive detariffing regime. On the other hand, Pacific Bell urges us to include tarified third-party billing and collection services in the list of services that could be detariffed by the filing of an advice letter.

#### **4.1.3. Sprint Nextel**

Sprint Nextel makes a single observation:<sup>53</sup>

"[I]f the Commission should elect to provide for the detariffing of *retail* telecommunications services, other than 'basic exchange service,' it should take care to specify that it is *not* ordering the detariffing of *wholesale* services, for which all existing tariff filing requirements should be retained."

#### **4.1.4. Cox**

Like Verizon and Pacific Bell, Cox states that the Commission should allow carriers to detariff services voluntarily, and that Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 does not authorize mandatory detariffing.<sup>54</sup> Cox also questions whether the competition findings in Phase I of this proceeding meet the statutory

---

<sup>52</sup> Comments of Pacific Bell Telephone Company (U 1001 C)Addressing Legal and Implementation Issues Related to Detariffing Telecommunications Services (September 25, 2006)

<sup>53</sup> Opening Brief of Sprint Nextel on Detariffing Issues Identified in D.06-08-030 (September 25, 2006)

<sup>54</sup> Opening Comments of Cox California Telecom, LLC (U 5684 C)Regarding Detariffing (September 25, 2006)

standard. Cox points out that, while the statute requires the Commission to consider market share in a competition analysis, the URF Phase I decision disapproves of and disclaims reliance on market share in its competition analysis.<sup>55</sup> Cox adds that “the URF decision could not possibly serve as the basis for the findings required by Section 495.7(b), since the issue of detariffing was not addressed in detail in that decision.”<sup>56</sup> Cox also argues that the “limitation of liability” exclusion contained in Section 495.7(g) should be interpreted only to eliminate the limitations of liability as found in filed tariffs. Limitations of liability contained in contracts that replace tariffs should not be proscribed by the language of Section 495.7(g).<sup>57</sup> Finally, Cox urges the Commission to adopt specific standardized terms and conditions that carriers could incorporate in contracts with their customers in place of tariffs.<sup>58</sup>

#### **4.1.5. SureWest**

Like the other large ILECs, SureWest endorsed permissive detariffing,<sup>59</sup> adding that the Commission should recommend to the Legislature that Section 495.7 be amended to permit full detariffing of all services including basic service,<sup>60</sup> and that the Commission should do away with the requirement that

---

<sup>55</sup> *Id.*, at 5

<sup>56</sup> *Id.*, FN 3, at 5.

<sup>57</sup> *Id.*, at 7-8.

<sup>58</sup> *Id.*, at 12.

<sup>59</sup> Comments of SureWest Telephone (U 1015 C) on Detariffing Issues in Response to Paragraph 10 of D.06-08-030 (September 25, 2006)

<sup>60</sup> *Id.*, at 3.

contracts be filed with the Commission.<sup>61</sup> SureWest proposes an 18-month transition period if the Commission chose to order detariffing.<sup>62</sup>

#### **4.1.6. Frontier**

Frontier's comments<sup>63</sup> mirror those of SureWest, supporting permissive detariffing and the elimination of filed contracts.

#### **4.1.7. Time Warner**

Time Warner also supports permissive detariffing.<sup>64</sup>

#### **4.1.8. DRA**

In its opening brief,<sup>65</sup> after discussing the relationship among tariffs, the filed rate doctrine and the limitation of carrier's liability conferred by filing tariffs, DRA concludes that the Commission lacks statutory authority to order mandatory detariffing and that the Commission should not eliminate tariffs without providing for a replacement source of reliable information about carriers' rates and services.<sup>66</sup> DRA also argues that the detariffing briefs called for in the URF Phase I decision are not evidence and cannot form the basis of a

---

<sup>61</sup> *Id.*

<sup>62</sup> *Id.*, at 5.

<sup>63</sup> Comments of Citizens Telecommunications Company of California Inc. (U 1024 C)d/b/a Frontier Communications of California on Decision 06-08-030 Regarding Detariffing (September 25, 2006).

<sup>64</sup> Opening Brief of Time Warner Cable Information Services (California), LLC (U 6874 C)Concerning Detariffing of Telecommuications Services (September 25, 2006).

<sup>65</sup> Brief of the Division of Ratepayer Advocates on Detariffing Issues (September 29, 2006) ("DRA Brief").

<sup>66</sup> *Id.*, at 3.

reasoned decision regarding detariffing.<sup>67</sup> Although DRA questions the due process given parties on this issue, DRA “acknowledges that the time is ripe to consider whether traditional tariffs are the best vehicle to serve consumer and Commission interests under the newly adopted regulatory regime.”<sup>68</sup>

DRA points out that the plain language of Section 495.7 contemplates a permissive process whereby carriers apply to detariff specific services rather than a mandatory detariffing order by the Commission.<sup>69</sup> DRA also argues that the URF Phase I decision improperly conflates “basic service” with “basic residential service.”<sup>70</sup> While recognizing that detariffing may benefit consumers by eliminating the liability shield provided by the filed rate doctrine, DRA argues that consumers will lack adequate information on which to base telephone service decisions unless the Commission couples detariffing with improved consumer access to information about carriers’ prices, terms, and conditions of service.<sup>71</sup> In particular, DRA recommends that we follow the lead of Colorado Public Utilities Commission and require that all carriers post on their web sites “the rates, terms and conditions associated with all California intrastate telecommunications services and service bundles that they offer, regardless of whether those services are tarified or detarified.”<sup>72</sup> In addition,

---

<sup>67</sup> *Id.*, at 4-5 and see FN 6, above.

<sup>68</sup> Amended Brief of DRA and Disability Rights Advocates on Detariffing Issues (October 3, 2006) (“Amended DRA/Disability Rights Advocates Brief”) at 2.

<sup>69</sup> DRA Brief, at 5-7.

<sup>70</sup> *Id.*, at 9-10.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.*, at 12-14.

<sup>72</sup> *Id.*, at 16.

DRA asserts that carriers should be required to provide the Communications Division and DRA with one-day notice of any changes in prices, terms, and conditions for all California services and service bundles and maintain for a period of at least two years an archive of their service offerings at a public Internet site.<sup>73</sup> DRA also recommends that carriers notify their customers 30 days in advance of any price increases or price-affecting changes to terms and conditions.<sup>74</sup>

#### **4.1.9. TURN**

TURN's opening brief states that the statute does not allow for mandatory detariffing but instead allows for permissive detariffing. TURN argues in general that if the Commission were to permit detariffing, it must eliminate old rules that insulate carriers from liability and adopt new rules that ensure consumers receive adequate information about prices and services and have meaningful recourse for complaints in a post-tariff world.<sup>75</sup> TURN also objects to using the advice letter procedure adopted in the URF Phase I decision as a vehicle to accomplish detariffing on the grounds that the decision is unclear about the manner in which advice letters will be protested and reviewed.

TURN makes the following specific recommendations:

---

<sup>73</sup> *Id.*, at 16.

<sup>74</sup> *Id.*, at 17.

<sup>75</sup> Opening Brief of The Utility Reform Network Regarding Detariffing (September 29, 2006)

1. The Commission needs to make the specific findings outlined in Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 before ordering detariffing of any services. The market power findings of the URF Phase I decision are inadequate for this purpose.<sup>76</sup>
2. Any carrier that is allowed to detariff a service should lose the protections of the filed rate doctrine and the limitation of liability for that service.<sup>77</sup>
3. The Commission should review the effect of its detariffing order within two years of implementation.<sup>78</sup>
4. The Commission should require carriers to file and post price lists for all services.<sup>79</sup>
5. The Commission should require carriers to provide customers with advance notice of rate changes, changes in terms or conditions of service, and ownership changes.<sup>80</sup>
6. The Commission should adopt new rules to prohibit deceptive or abusive marketing practices.<sup>81</sup>
7. The Commission should prohibit carriers from making unilateral changes in consumer contracts and incorporating tariff terms and conditions in them by reference.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> *Id.*, at 10-11.

<sup>77</sup> *Id.*, at 18-19.

<sup>78</sup> *Id.*, at 19-20.

<sup>79</sup> *Id.*, at 13-14.

<sup>80</sup> *Id.*, at 14-15.

<sup>81</sup> *Id.*, at 15-17.

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*, at 20-21.

8. Carriers should have the burden of proof to show that rates, terms and conditions are just and reasonable and non-discriminatory in any complaint proceeding.<sup>83</sup>

9. The Commission should not order mandatory detariffing but instead consider requests to detariff on a case-by-case basis and should not detariff certain services, such as E911.<sup>84</sup>

#### **4.2. The Criteria of Section 495.7 Have Been Met**

Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 permits us to establish procedures to allow URF Carriers to detariff services, if certain requirements have been met. We explain below that Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 requirements have been met. Moreover, as a policy matter, detariffing procedures will allow carriers flexibility in offering various rates, terms, and conditions for services. Indeed, the consumer advocates have pointed out that, in light of the Phase 1 decision and the advice letter process, tariffs may “no longer serve the same consumer protections as they have in the past.”<sup>85</sup> These parties have acknowledged that detariffing has its place in a deregulatory environment – if accomplished with sufficient safeguards.<sup>86</sup> As we discuss further below, tariffs *afford carriers*

---

<sup>83</sup> *Id.*, at 22-23.

<sup>84</sup> *Id.*, at 23-24.

<sup>85</sup> See TURN Brief at 5; Amended Brief of DRA and Disability Rights Advocates at 3 (noting that a “properly implemented detariffing plan could alleviate certain consumer harms of the current tariffing regime”).

<sup>86</sup> See, e.g., DRA and Disability Rights Advocates Brief at 3-4 (noting that tariffs are “not even sufficient to provide consumers and the Commission with truly useful and timely information about service rates, terms, and conditions” but that detariffing can only provide meaningful customer protections against market power abuse if the Commission “completely eradicates all of the benefits conferred on telecommunications

*Footnote continued on next page*

*protection* under the filed rate doctrine and limitation of liability provisions, and in fact, are often cumbersome, legalistic and unwieldy documents that are difficult for most consumers to read or understand. We conclude that we should establish detariffing procedures for URF carriers as discussed below and believe that our existing safeguards provide adequate protection for consumers.<sup>87</sup>

Although we believe that the requirements of Section 495.7 are satisfied by our existing statutes and rules, we adopt additional new safeguards in this decision to protect consumers who purchase detariffed services. For example, if a carrier incorporates by reference rates, terms or conditions into a term contract for detariffed services, we will require that carrier to provide 30-day notice to its customers of any increase to rates, or more restrictive terms or conditions and absent consumer consent, the carrier shall permit the customer an opportunity to opt out of the contract without any penalty. We will also require a carrier to post on its website and make available without charge via a toll free number the rates, terms, and conditions for its tariffed and *detariffed retail services* and to comply with certain notice requirements for increases to rates and changes to terms and conditions. An archive of a carrier's retail rates (both tariffed and detariffed) must be made available on the web for three years, with dates of effectiveness and geographic applicability clearly delineated.

---

carriers by today's tariff regime - including not only the protections of the 'filed rate' doctrine, but also the limitations on liability.") As discussed below, in the absence of tariffs, carriers cannot assert the filed rate doctrine. Further, any limitations of liability that are approved in tariffs would not apply.

<sup>87</sup> Although the record reflects that parties have addressed policy issues concerning detariffing, we are permitting parties, to the extent that they have not done so already, an opportunity to address in their comments on this proposed decision all policy issues that they believe should be considered in establishing detariffing for carriers.

**4.2.1. The Commission Has Found that the AT&T, Verizon, SureWest and Frontier Lack Significant Market Power (Section 495.7(b)(1) is Satisfied)**

Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 outlines the conditions under which the Commission may establish procedures for carriers to apply to exempt services from tariffing requirements:

- (a) The commission may, by rule or order, establish procedures to allow telephone or telegraph companies to apply for the exemption of certain telecommunications services from the tariffing requirements of Sections 3454, 489, 491, and 495.
- (b) The commission *may, by rule or order, partially or completely exempt certain telecommunications services, except basic exchange services* offered by telephone or telegraph corporations, from the tariffing requirements of Sections 454, 489, 491, and 495 if either of the following conditions is met:
  - (1) The commission finds that the telephone corporation lacks significant market power in the market for that service for which an exemption from Sections 454, 489, 491, and 495 is being requested. Criteria to determine market power shall include, but not be limited to, the following: company size, market share, and the type of service for which exemption is being requested. The commission shall promulgate rules for determining market power based on these and other criteria.
  - (2) The commission finds that a telephone corporation is offering a service in a given market for which competitive alternatives are available to most consumers, and the commission has determined that sufficient consumer protections exist in the form of rules and enforcement mechanisms to minimize the risk to consumers and competition from unfair competition or anticompetitive behavior in the market for the competitive telecommunications service for which a provider is

requesting an exemption from Sections 454, 489, 491, and 495.<sup>88</sup>

Thus, the Commission has the legal authority under Section 495.7 to establish permissive detariffing procedures when certain requirements have been met. The detariffing policies we announce today rest securely on the recently concluded fact-finding and rule-making in URF Phase I. We reject the argument of some parties that there is an insufficient record to support our decision to establish detariffing procedures. In fact, in Phase I of the URF rulemaking, we found that the record was sufficient to permit us to make market power findings of the kind required by Public Utilities Code § 495.7(b)(1).<sup>89</sup> In making these findings, we relied on evidence supplied by the four large incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) regarding the state of the market for voice communications in California. This evidence included proof of: (a) rapid decline in the number of traditional land lines operated by the ILECs, (b) rapid growth in the number of wireless phones and (c) near-substitutability of wireless, cable and Internet-based voice communications for traditional land lines.

The decline in land lines and the growth in wireless access lines were documented in the FCC's 2004 Local Competition Report, "Local Telephone

---

<sup>88</sup> Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 (emphasis added).

<sup>89</sup> Findings of Fact 50 and 51 from D. 06-08-030 states:

50. Review of the extensive record in this proceeding shows that Verizon, AT&T, SureWest, and Frontier lack the ability to limit the supply of telecommunications services in the voice communications market, and therefore lack the market power needed to sustain prices above the levels that a competitive market would produce.

51. This lack of market power pertains throughout the service territories of Verizon, AT&T, SureWest, and Frontier, and pertains to both business and residential services.

Competition: Status as of June 30, 2004,” Federal Communications Commission, Industry Analysis and Technology Division Wireline Competition Bureau, December 2004).<sup>90</sup>

The near-substitutability of the VoIP and cable telephony for traditional land lines was documented in the FCC’s 2004 Broadband Report, “High-Speed Services for Internet Access: Status as of June 30, 2004,” FCC Industry Analysis and Technology Division – Wireline Competition Bureau, December 2004.<sup>91</sup>

Additional evidence for the competitive nature of the market for voice communications in the service territories of the four large ILECs was drawn from the FCC’s Form 477 data. As summarized by Verizon expert witness Aron at paragraph 58 of her Opening Declaration, these data demonstrate that competitive local exchange carriers presently offer service in Zip Codes that together encompass 90% of Verizon’s service territory.<sup>92</sup>

In our discussion of market power in Phase I, we considered criteria such as those listed in Section 495.7(b)(1) and concluded that one of the criteria, market share, was not the only controlling factor in a market power analysis. Indeed, the statutory language requires that the Commission consider the criteria of company size, market share, type of service but *does not limit* the Commission’s consideration to only those factors in coming to its

---

<sup>90</sup> See D.06-08-030 at 92, FN. 359 (citing FCC 2004 Local Competition Report).

<sup>91</sup> D.06-08-030 at 76.

<sup>92</sup> See D.06-08-030 at 119 (citing Verizon evidence).

determination.<sup>93</sup> In analyzing the relationship of market share to market power, we followed the reasoning of the FCC in its 1996 AT&T detariffing order:

[I]t is well-established that market share, by itself, is not the sole determining factor of whether a firm possesses market power...Other factors, such as demand and supply elasticities, conditions of entry and other market conditions, must be examined to determine whether a particular firm exercises market power in the relevant market.<sup>94</sup>

Applying this reasoning to the record, we concluded that the relevant market cannot be limited to a specific type of telecommunications service and instead should be defined broadly to encompass a variety of services and service providers, including CLECs, cable companies, VoIP, and wireless service providers.<sup>95</sup> We found that the four large ILECs had provided compelling evidence that they faced sufficient competition from CLECs and from non-traditional providers of voice communications services such as wireless

---

<sup>93</sup> We considered factors such as 1) the relevant voice communications market; 2) the extent to which entry or the threat of entry by competitors is sufficiently real to prevent the exercise of market power by the incumbents; 3) the extent to which competing communications technologies can check the market power of the wireline incumbents; and 4) the extent to which the presence of competitors in the service territories of ILECs already offers an alternative supply of telecommunications services and thereby provides a check on market power. D.06-08-030 at 52-53. These factors address criteria similar to those listed in Section 495.7(b)(1) such as type of service, relevant market, and other important criteria such as the extent to which competitors may check the incumbents' exercise of market power.

<sup>94</sup> D.06-08-030, p. 127.

<sup>95</sup> D.06-08-030 at 74.

companies, cable companies and VOIP services to prevent them from unilaterally raising prices for any of their voice communications services.<sup>96</sup>

Regarding Verizon's evidence, we said:

In summary, Verizon has developed a record in this proceeding that demonstrates that policy, technology, and market developments prevent it from exercising market power in its California service territories. The extensive presence of competitors in Verizon's service territory and the ease of expanding service by both wireless and VOIP carriers makes it clear that Verizon could not limit the supply of telecommunications services provided in any part of its California service territories and thereby cannot sustain above-market prices.<sup>97</sup>

Regarding AT&T's evidence, we said,

While AT&T does not follow Verizon's lead in showing the ubiquitous presence of competitors throughout its service territory, AT&T nonetheless has convincingly demonstrated that competitive forces limit its market power.<sup>98</sup>

We reached similar conclusions regarding the markets for voice communications in the service territories of Frontier and SureWest. Our market

---

<sup>96</sup> D.06-08-030 at 92, *see also* Finding of Fact Para. 50. Specifically Verizon submitted evidence that wireless migration accounted for "*approximately half of ILEC primary residential wireline losses,*" with increasing customers willing to "cut the cord." D.06-08-030 at 119, citing Verizon Opening Brief (citing Aron Reply Declaration at ¶ 72). AT&T also provided evidence that from the years 2000-2004, "SBC California lost almost 19 percent of its residential switched access lines, including a loss of over 21 percent of its non-lifeline primary residential switched access lines... [and] 23 percent of its business switched access lines." D.06-08-030 at 122, citing Pacific Bell Opening Brief at 61.

<sup>97</sup> *Id.*, at 118.

<sup>98</sup> *Id.*, at 120.

power findings were limited to the state's four large ILECs, and exclude the small fraction served by rural local exchange carriers who are still subject to traditional rate-of-return regulation and have their rates set through general rate cases (GRC-LECs).

Consistent with this reading of the record, we rejected the evidence of TURN and DRA regarding market share and entity size that sought to demonstrate that the relevant markets were not competitive:

From an economic standpoint, the market share analysis provided by TURN and DRA is not particularly useful or probative for evaluating market power in the voice communications market. Market share tests are inherently backward looking and not good predictors of future developments, particularly in a rapidly changing industry like telecommunications. For example, U.S. VoIP subscribership had reached 2.7 million in mid-2005 – a six-fold increase from the prior year – and is expected to continue to grow rapidly. [Citation omitted.] In addition, wireless carriers now compete in offering voice communications services. [Citation omitted.] DRA's and TURN's market share analyses do not reflect these developments. Indeed, their HHI figures completely exclude any consideration of competition from wireless or VoIP providers. Thus both the rapid changing technological environment and the overly narrow market definition combine to make the HHI figures calculated by TURN and DRA meaningless for our analysis of the market situation.<sup>99</sup>

While our recent Telecommunications Consumer Bill of Rights decision, D.06-03-013, adopted the kinds of rules and consumer protection mechanisms

---

<sup>99</sup> *Id.*, at 128.

required by § 495.7(b)(2),<sup>100</sup> we choose to rely solely on the extensive market power findings of the URF Phase I decision to support the conclusions reached in this phase of the proceeding regarding detariffing. Therefore, we believe that Section 495.7(b) has been satisfied.

#### **4.2.2. The Requirements of Sections 495.7(c) and (d) Have Also Been Met**

Some parties noted that the requirements of Sections 495.7(c) and (d) must be met before the Commission establishes detariffing procedures.<sup>101</sup> We believe that these requirements are met by existing statutory and regulatory requirements, along with our adoption of additional safeguards in this decision.

Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(c) requires that the Commission establish consumer protection rules for detariffed services in order to satisfy various requirements. Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(c)(1) specifically requires that there are rules regarding availability of rates, terms, and conditions of service to consumers; and Section 495.7(c)(2) requires that the Commission establish rules regarding notices to consumers of rate increases and decreases, changes in terms and conditions of service, and change of ownership.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> *Id.*, at 185. The rules adopted in D.06-03-013 enumerating consumer rights vis-à-vis telephone and telegraph corporations and specific prohibitions against billing consumers for unauthorized services, were codified in GO 168.

<sup>101</sup> *See, e.g.*, TURN Brief at 12, 18, Amended Brief of DRA and Disability Rights Advocates at 6, 7.

<sup>102</sup> *See* Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(c): Before implementing procedures to allow telephone corporations to apply for the exemption of certain telecommunications services from the tariffing requirements of Sections 454, 489, 491, and 495...the commission shall establish consumer protection rules for those exempted services that include, but are not limited to:

*Footnote continued on next page*

The requirements of Sections 495.7(c)(1) and (2) are already addressed by existing statutes, including Pub. Util. Code Section 2896. The statute requires carriers to provide customers with sufficient information on which to make informed choices among telecommunications services and providers.<sup>103</sup> To fulfill these statutory conditions further, however, we adopt new requirements for carriers seeking to detariff (which will be established in Telecommunications Industry Rules 5.2 and 5.3 in GO 96-B in our companion decision being adopted today). These new industry rules require carriers that detariff their services to make available at no cost to the consumer information substantially equivalent to the information previously contained in their tariffs by posting the information (rates, terms, and conditions for services) on their websites and providing a toll-free number for consumers to call to obtain a copy of rates, terms, and conditions. We also require that carriers who have detariffed services must archive this information for a period of three years.

With regard to Section 495.7(c)(2), today we also establish new rules that are being reflected in GO 96-B that require the URF Carriers that have detariffed

---

(1) Rules regarding the availability of rates, terms, and conditions of service to consumers.

(2) Rules regarding notices to consumers of rate increases and decreases, changes in terms and conditions of service, and change of ownership.

<sup>103</sup> See, e.g., Pub. Util. Code Section 2896(a):

2896. The Commission shall require telephone corporations to provide customer service to telephone customers that includes, but is not limited to, all the following:

(a) Sufficient information upon which to make informed choices among telecommunications services and providers. This includes, but is not limited to, information regarding the provider's identity, service options, pricing, and terms and conditions of service.

services to provide 30 days notice to customers prior to any rate increase, changes in terms and conditions, or change of ownership.<sup>104</sup> We also will require an URF Carrier that offers detariffed services in a term contract to provide customers 30-day notice and obtain consent before unilaterally changing any rates, terms, or conditions to such term contract. Moreover, this Commission already requires carriers to obtain approval prior to transferring control to another entity and included in its requirements for all carriers is notice to customers of the transaction.<sup>105</sup> Given the findings in the Phase 1 decision regarding the state of competition, we do not believe that notice of rate decreases to consumers is necessary. Indeed, even TURN acknowledges that advance notice of *rate decreases* or *change of ownership* may be unnecessary if the change does not affect services.<sup>106</sup> Thus, we believe that these safeguards meet Section 495.7(c)(2)'s requirements.

Section 495.7(c)(3)-(6) require rules to identify and eliminate unacceptable marketing practices including fraudulent practices; to assure that aggrieved customers have access to low-cost, effective, and efficient avenues for relief; to ensure customers that they have privacy for services; to assure a telephone corporation will cooperate with Commission investigations of complaints. The Commission already has in place numerous rules and safeguards to satisfy Section 495.7(c)(3), particularly against slamming and cramming. As part of our telecommunications Consumer Protection Initiative, the Commission also

---

<sup>104</sup> See GO 96-B, Telecommunications Industry Rules 5.1 and 5.2. Carriers with tariffed services are already subject to such notice requirements.

<sup>105</sup> Pub. Util. Code Section 854. *See also* D.06-10-021, D.97-06-096.

<sup>106</sup> TURN Brief at 14-15.

adopted enhanced investigation and enforcement capability via an eight person Telecommunications Fraud Unit, and a consumer fraud toll-free hotline.<sup>107</sup> Further, we have published in thirteen languages consumer brochures on slamming, cramming, complaint procedures, how to understand your phone bill, and tips on purchasing wireless services.<sup>108</sup> These safeguards fully satisfy the additional requirements of Section 495.7(c)(3)-(5).<sup>109</sup> Further, several provisions of the Pub. Util. Code require that telephone corporations cooperate with the

---

<sup>107</sup> D.06-08-030.

<sup>108</sup> The Commission makes this consumer information available both in [www.CalPhoneInfo.com](http://www.CalPhoneInfo.com) and in brochure form to consumers. The information is available in consumer friendly “plain English”, at the third grade reading level.

<sup>109</sup> Section 495.7(c)(3)-(6) require:

(3) Rules to identify and eliminate unacceptable marketing practices including, but not limited to, fraudulent marketing practices.

(4) Rules to assure that aggrieved customers have speedy, low-cost and effective avenues available to seek relief in a reasonable time.

(5) Rules to assure customers that [sic] their right to informational privacy for services over which the commission has oversight.

(6) Rules to assure a telephone corporation’s cooperation with the commission investigations of customer complaints.

In Appendix D to D. 06-03-013, our decision adopting revised consumer protection rules, we identified more than 160 existing Federal and state statutes, regulations or Commission decisions that establish consumer protections for the benefit of telecommunications customers. For example, Pub. Util. Code Section 2889.9 prohibits parties from misrepresenting affiliation with carrier when soliciting or implementing customer agreement to purchase services. Pub. Util. Code Sections 2891 and 2893 also prohibit carriers from releasing certain personal information of subscribers to residential service and require carriers to block Caller ID information for consumers at no charge. The Commission has also established in the Consumer Bill of Rights that consumers have the right to participate in public policy proceedings, to be informed of their rights and to have effective recourse if their rights are violated.

Commission in its investigations and there is no need for further rules or requirements emphasizing the Commission's authority in this regard.<sup>110</sup>

We reject TURN's argument that we have not made findings sufficient to satisfy the requirements of Section 495.7(d). In finding that the URF ILECs lack market power throughout their service territories,<sup>111</sup> we have found they lack the ability to engage in the kind of anti-competitive pricing behavior referenced in the statute. We have also frozen the price of basic service in areas where carriers receive High Cost Fund B subsidies pending further review in R.06-06-028 and capped the price for basic service in all other areas until January 2009. In addition, we find that because URF carriers will still be required to post rates, terms, and conditions for their services on their websites and provide a toll-free number for consumers to obtain a copy of such information, they cannot engage in anti-competitive pricing without detection. Further, by deregulating the pricing of all but basic residential services, we have eliminated the financial incentive for a licensed carrier to engage in cross-subsidization with an unlicensed affiliate.

Accordingly, given these findings, we believe that the requirements of Section 495.7 have been met.

#### **4.3. Permissive Detariffing Procedure**

In our discussion of detariffing in the URF Phase I decision, we indicated that our preference was to issue an order detariffing nearly all

---

<sup>110</sup> See, e.g., Pub. Util. Code Sections 581 and 582.

<sup>111</sup> D.06-08-030 at 183.

telecommunications services within a certain time period.<sup>112</sup> However, it is not clear that the Public Utilities Code authorizes us to take such a sweeping step. Several parties assert that the Commission does not have authority to mandate detariffing. Section 495.7 speaks of granting carrier requests to detariff *particular* services. It does not explicitly authorize us to enter a blanket order mandating detariffing. On the other hand, the statute was enacted at a time when the market for telecommunications services was not competitive and all telephone services were obtained from a single monopoly provider. Having found that all markets in which the state's largest ILECs offer services are now competitive, we could conclude that requiring individual applications for detariffing (other than from a GRC-LEC) is no longer in the public interest because all such applications should be granted.

This was the position taken by the FCC in 1996 when it decided to mandate, rather than permit, the detariffing of all telecommunications services offered by non-dominant interexchange carriers. In its detariffing order, the FCC held that under the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 "complete detariffing of interstate, domestic, interexchange services offered by nondominant interexchange carriers is in the public interest, and that permissive detariffing of such services is not in the public interest."<sup>113</sup>

We recognize that the state and federal statutes are different, but the public policy issues we face are quite similar to those the FCC faced in 1996.

---

<sup>112</sup> "We preliminarily propose ordering carriers to cancel tariffs during a certain time period, either by replacement, supplement or expiration." D.06-08-030, at 180.

<sup>113</sup> 11 FCC Rcd 20730, 20768 (1996) (emphasis added).

While mandatory detariffing automatically places all carriers on a level playing field and eliminates the need for further Commission involvement in the selection and pricing of services, permissive detariffing may lead to the opposite result to the extent that carriers are able to preserve those elements of the old model that are beneficial to them, such as the filed rate doctrine and the limitation of liability,<sup>114</sup> but avoid the restrictions that tariffs otherwise would impose. To guard against this possibility, any permissive detariffing regime would have to bar carriers from retaining tariff protections when cancelling tariffs.

However, given that mandatory detariffing may not be authorized under the statute, we will instead permit carriers to apply to cancel tariffs by filing Tier 2 advice letters (as defined in revised GO 96-B with the Telecommunications Industry Rules). After a service has been detariffed, we will not require the URF carrier to file an individual case basis (ICB) contract.

Having concluded that the requirements of Section 495.7 have been met, we direct staff to approve a request to detariff filed as a Tier 2 advice letter provided that the advice letter is otherwise in compliance with GO 96-B and our rules and does not propose to cancel:

1. A tariff for basic service;<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> Section 495.7(g) removes the protection of limited liability from any detariffed service.

<sup>115</sup> Section 495.7 addresses the detariffing of all services except “basic exchange service.” In Phase I of this decision, we proposed to consider detariffing of all services except “basic residential service.” We discuss below our decision to refer to the term “basic service,” as defined in D.96-10-066, as opposed to “basic residential service.”

2. A tariff that includes a requirement or condition imposed in an enforcement/complaint or merger proceeding;
3. A tariff for 911 or other emergency services;
4. A tariff relating to customer direct access to an interexchange carrier or customer choice of an interexchange carrier; or
5. A tariff for a service that was not granted full pricing flexibility in D.06-08-030.
6. A tariff that contains obligations pursuant to Carrier of Last Resort obligations, or state or federal law.

If a tariff does not fall within the above exceptions, the URF carrier may seek to cancel it by filing a Tier 2 advice letter.<sup>116</sup> Although staff will be under a general instruction to approve an advice letter if it complies on its face with the requirements we adopt in this decision, staff review is necessary to determine if the advice letter seeks to detariff a service in the above categories for which we do not allow detariffing.

We do not think that, at least as an initial matter, carriers should be permitted to self-certify such compliance. Pursuant to our newly-revised GO 96-B, if no protest is filed within 20 days of the filing and staff takes no action, the advice letter is deemed approved at the end of the 30-day period. If the advice letter is protested, pursuant to GO 96, staff is required to review and investigate the protest and, if at the end of the 30 day period, staff needs more time to investigate, it will notify the carrier that it needs to extend the period of

---

<sup>116</sup> See Telecommunications Industry Rules, Rule 7.2(3) in Appendix C to GO 96-B.

time to review the advice letter.<sup>117</sup> See GO 96-B General Rule 7.6.1. During staff's review, the advice letter is suspended and only becomes effective upon staff's written approval or Commission resolution approving it. See General Rule 7.3.4.

Once a service is detariffed, the carrier need not file anything further with the Commission regarding the detariffed service, including advice letters or contracts. However, the carrier must notify customers of increased rates, or more restrictive terms and conditions and further must post all available information on its website.

An URF Carrier may not detariff existing services/promotional offerings/bundles 18 months after the effective date of this decision. If an URF Carrier seeks to offer on a detariffed basis a "new service," the carrier is permitted to file an informational filing describing the new service that it intends to offer as detariffed as long as the new service does not fall into the categories of services for which we prohibit detariffing, as discussed further below). Although we have established an 18 month implementation period for carriers to request detariffing of their existing services, we do not apply the 18 month implementation period to "new services," as technological innovations will continue to result in new services that carriers are not currently aware of or are offering at this time, and which should not be subject to traditional regulation. It is consistent with our detariffing policy and our findings in Phase I of the URF

---

<sup>117</sup> If there is a protest, the advice letter may be suspended if necessary for staff to complete review of the issues raised by the protest. Pursuant to General Rule 7.6, staff may approve the advice letter if the protest is not made on proper grounds; the protest may be rejected on a technical basis if the protest is clearly erroneous. Pursuant to General Rule 7.4.2., the grounds for protest are narrow; for example, a party could

*Footnote continued on next page*

proceeding to require these carriers to file the “new services” as detariffed on an informal, informational basis. *See* General Rule 6.1 of GO 96-B. The informational filings will allow us to review and ensure that a carrier will not impermissibly file a “new service” as detariffed, where such new service falls within the categories of services for which we prohibit detariffing. However, if the carrier seeks to offer the “new service” on a tariffed basis under Tier 1, the carrier may do so.

We now discuss the categories of services and/or tariffs that may not be detariffed below.

#### **4.4. Services That May Not be Detariffed Under Tier 2 Advice Letter**

##### **4.4.1. Exception: Basic Service**

Phase I of this proceeding preserved basic residential service as a tariffed service and we do not modify that determination in this phase.<sup>118</sup> However, we clarify that by “basic residential service,” we meant “basic service” as defined in D.96-10-066. DRA questions whether the terms “basic residential service” and “basic exchange service” are co-extensive and, if not, how they relate to one another.<sup>119</sup> We find that the term “basic residential service” means “basic exchange service,” or “basic service” as defined in D.96-10-066.

---

protest that an advice letter is seeking to detariff a service that falls within the exceptions (e.g., basic service), and staff would need to review that allegation.

<sup>118</sup> Ordering Para. 21 of D. 06-08-030: “With the exception of conditions relating to basic residential rates, all asymmetric requirements concerning marketing, disclosure or administrative processes shall be eliminated.” The phrase “basic residential rates” might more accurately have been replaced with “basic service rates”.

<sup>119</sup> DRA Opening Brief at 9-10 (noting that the Commission has identified no language in the statute that defines “basic exchange service” as “residential service” only).

We believe that the phrase “basic exchange service” is equivalent to “basic service;” in D.96-10-066, we used the phrase “basic service or *basic exchange service*” as interchangeable terms.<sup>120</sup> We further defined “basic service” in D.96-10-066 to mean the service elements that a provider of local exchange service must offer to each *residential customer* who requests service from the provider.<sup>121</sup> Because “basic service” is limited to a form of *residential* service, the phrase “basic residential service” that we initially proposed as the exception to detariffing in the Phase I decision is unnecessary. Instead, we use the defined term “basic service” to describe the statutory exception to detariffing. We reflect this definition in our modified GO 96-B.

#### **4.4.2. Exception: Asymmetric Obligations/Tariffs incorporating penalties or merger conditions**

As discussed above, we deferred to this Phase II the issue of how to address in the detariffing context those tariffs that incorporate requirements imposed by the Commission in an enforcement or complaint proceeding. Although these tariffs may result in “asymmetric” requirements of the kind that we eliminated in Phase I, we clarify that it was not our intention in adopting that decision to permit a carrier to use a one-day effective advice letter to lift a condition or requirement that we imposed in an enforcement or complaint case simply because it created an apparent regulatory asymmetry. On the contrary, we impose a penalty or requirement when a carrier violates one of our rules, i.e., when the carrier deliberately creates an asymmetry between its situation and that of other carriers by its own conduct. The purpose of our proceeding in such

---

<sup>120</sup> D.96-10-066, 1996 Cal. PUC LEXIS 1046, \*26.

<sup>121</sup> D.96-10-066 (Appendix D, Part 4).

a case, including the imposition of the penalty, is to restore the symmetry that the carrier's conduct has set askew. Accordingly, to the extent that Ordering Paragraph 21 of the URF Phase I decision could be read as authorizing carriers to use advice letters to cancel tariffs that include penalties or conditions imposed for prior misconduct, we reject that reading.

We recognize that, based on its plain language, some parties may have inadvertently misinterpreted Ordering Paragraph 21 of the Phase 1 decision. Consistent with the uniform regulatory framework that we established, Ordering Paragraph 21 was intended only to eliminate regulatory asymmetry among carriers with regard to marketing, disclosure or administrative processes that are contained within their tariffs, with the exception of conditions relating to basic service rates, or conditions or requirements imposed as a result of an enforcement or complaint case.<sup>122</sup> We also clarify that we also did not intend in Ordering Paragraph 21 to relieve URF carriers of specific conditions or requirements imposed on them through merger proceedings, or from other existing state and federal statutes (such as the requirements under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as they pertain to ILECs).

Our consistent practice has been that a penalty or condition/requirement imposed in a Commission decision may only be lifted by demonstrating compliance with its terms -- for example, by paying a fine or complying with certain conditions or requirements -- or by a subsequent Commission decision.

---

<sup>122</sup> We note that Conclusion of Law Paragraph 53 in the Phase 1 decision stated that “[p]arties should be able to modify their *tariffs* to eliminate asymmetric or company-specific restrictions on marketing practices, disclosure requirements or administrative processes.” D.06-08-030 at Conclusion of Law Para. 53 (emphasis added).

Before lifting such an obligation or requirement, the Commission must consider whether conditions have changed such that the requirement is no longer necessary (e.g., that the carrier has complied with its terms or that there is no longer a reason to continue the penalty or requirement in force). Moreover, in considering whether to lift a requirement imposed through an enforcement or complaint case, parties such as consumer representatives, including the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, and the carrier, may want to have the opportunity to address the issues implicated in modifying such a requirement or prior Commission decision. An advice letter, even one filed under Tier 3, which purports to cancel a tariff that includes a penalty or requirement imposed through an enforcement or complaint case is an inadequate means of guaranteeing full review of the carrier's post-penalty conduct. Accordingly, we conclude that a carrier required to file tariffs to comply with certain obligations or conditions imposed as a result of an enforcement/complaint case must file a petition to modify the underlying decision that imposes such penalty, requirements, or conditions. As discussed, a carrier similarly may not file an advice letter to remove obligations or conditions contained in its tariffs that were imposed by a merger case.

On a going forward basis, we put parties on notice that we prohibit the use of advice letters as a means of removing or reducing obligations imposed on carriers as a result of complaint or enforcement actions. Such obligations may be removed only by filing petitions to modify the original decisions. With regard to tariffs incorporating merger conditions, parties seeking to modify them should file separate applications or petitions to do so.

**4.4.3. Other Exceptions**

Different considerations lead us to conclude that the requirement to provide emergency service via 9-1-1 may not be modified or cancelled by filing an advice letter. The 9-1-1 system is a public safety necessity that must be equally available to all phone customers regardless of who provides their service. Permitting cancellation or modification of a 9-1-1 tariff by advice letter would undermine public safety and not be in the public interest. Any modifications to the 9-1-1 system should be adopted only as the result of a rulemaking that applies to all carriers and is incorporated in a subsequent Commission decision.

The exception for access to or change of an interexchange carrier recognizes the unique circumstance that a customer will necessarily use the services of such a carrier before forming a contractual relationship with it. For example, a customer dialing a number to access an interexchange carrier directly through its local exchange line will not form a contract with that carrier. Because they are ill-adapted to a contractual model, these services should also remain tariffed.

Finally, services that were not considered within the scope of this proceeding, such as wholesale tariffs and those matters we referred to our service quality and Universal Service Public Policy Proceeding (Lifeline) rulemakings, or other services for which we did not grant full pricing flexibility, cannot be cancelled by the advice letter procedure authorized in this proceeding. In addition, a carrier may not detariff any provisions pertaining to Carrier of Last Resort obligations. We consider AT&T's request for detariffing of billing and collection services provided to other carriers to be outside the scope of this proceeding and therefore deny its request.

#### **4.5. Additional Comments on Discrete Detariffing Issues Not Subject to Page Limitations**

In Ordering Paragraph 10 of D.06-08-030, we sought comment from parties as to the “legal and implementation issues” regarding detariffing. We stated in the URF Phase I decision that we would consider these comments in determining whether to detariff services.<sup>123</sup> As discussed, the record reflects that parties addressed legal, implementation, and policy issues, including whether the Commission should establish detariffing procedures.<sup>124</sup> However, in the interest of ensuring that parties are aware that they should comment on all issues surrounding detariffing (including policy issues), we note that parties may, *to the extent that they have not already*, address any policy issues that they would like to bring to the Commission’s attention. If parties have already filed comments on public policy issues concerning detariffing, they should not file repetitive arguments. However, if a party has not previously commented on this issue and wishes to do so, we will waive the page and content limitation under Rule 14.3 for comments on this specific issue.

We intend for these detariffing procedures to apply for all URF Carriers, including the four major ILECs, CLECs, and IXC. However, because there was some confusion as to whether these detariffing procedures would apply to

---

<sup>123</sup> D.06-08-030 at 186.

<sup>124</sup> In D.06-12-066, we clarified that “we did not make the determination to detariff in this [Phase I] Decision, nor did we make any findings pursuant to section 495.7,” and that we “merely articulated our intention to further consider the issue.” Accordingly, we requested that parties address legal and implementation issues pertaining to detariffing. We did not explicitly include “policy issues” in the notice for comment, but intended for parties to address all such issues.

IXCs,<sup>125</sup> we note that parties may also take this opportunity in commenting on the PD to address whether the detariffing procedures established here should apply to IXCs and supersede existing procedures adopted by the Commission. For purposes of commenting on this specific issue, we will also waive the page and content limitations for comments on proposed decisions (Rule 14.3). Parties shall comply with the page and content limitations of Rule 14.3 for commenting on the remainder of the proposed decision.

#### **4.6. Responses to Specific Comments**

The four ILECs and all others who commented on the issue agree that Section 495.7 may not permit mandatory detariffing. We concur and for that reason have adopted a permissive detariffing regime as discussed above.

DRA and TURN also urge us to clarify that carriers will no longer enjoy the protection of the filed rate doctrine<sup>126</sup> or the limitation of liability for services that they have detariffed. We agree that carriers offering detariffed services cannot use the filed rate doctrine or any tariffed limitation of liability as a defense in any action involving the detariffed services. In short, two significant changes in carriers' potential liability will separate tariffed from detariffed

---

<sup>125</sup> See, e.g., Verizon Opening Brief at 3. The Commission has previously established procedures for detariffing IXCs. See, e.g., D.96-09-098, D.98-08-031.

<sup>126</sup> The filed rate doctrine consists of several elements: a carrier cannot charge any price for a service other than the price contained in its tariff; the price in the tariff is per se reasonable; the carrier must offer the same price to all customers; and parties who deal with the carrier are deemed to have knowledge of the price in the tariff. The filed rate doctrine is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it limits what a carrier can charge for a service and mandates that the carrier charge the same rate for that service to all customers; on the other hand, it provides a defense to the carrier in lawsuits that allege the rate is unreasonable or discriminatory. *Louisville & Nashville R.R. Co. v. Maxwell*, 237 U.S. 94 (1915)

services. In competitive markets, the risk of liability operates to discipline the behavior of market participants. In particular, since carriers will no longer be required to file rates, there is no logical reason to continue to afford them the protection of the filed rate doctrine as to such detariffed rates. As for the limitation of liability, Section 596.7(g) explicitly notes that a carrier's detariffed services will not be subject to the tariffed limitations of liability.

TURN and DRA urge us to mandate certain disclosures in contracts entered into between carriers and customers as a replacement for tariffs while Cox urges us to rule that carriers may limit their liability in such contracts notwithstanding the language of Section 495.7(g). We decline to adopt any content regulation for contracts.<sup>127</sup> In a competitive market, carriers compete on both price and non-prices terms. By offering different contract terms and conditions, carriers seek to differentiate themselves from their competitors.

With respect to DRA's and TURN's proposals for new rules requiring carriers to disclose rates, terms and conditions of service and to publish such information on their web sites, we note that are requiring URF carriers that seek to detariff to publish on their websites their rates, charges, terms and conditions of service and to offer a toll-free number for consumers to obtain a copy of such information.

---

<sup>127</sup> In D.98-08-031, we established consumer protection rules for detariffing of interexchange carriers. In that decision, we concluded that Section 495.7 does not prohibit carriers offering detariffed services from imposing a limitation of liability provision in their contracts, but we interpreted Section 495.7 as "precluding a carrier offering detariffed services from enjoying the benefits that a *Commission-sanctioned tariffed* limitation of liability provision confers on a carrier." See D.98-08-031, 1998 Cal. PUC LEXIS 592, 600 (1998).

We reject TURN's proposal that in any complaint proceeding we require carriers to prove that their rates, terms and conditions are just, reasonable and non-discriminatory. In a competitive market, where contracts have succeeded tariffs, complaints by customers are likely to allege either that a carrier is in breach of its contract or of its statutory obligation to provide sufficient information for a consumer to make informed choices. The allocation of the burden of proof on these and similar issues is a matter for the judge hearing the case to decide.

We agree with Sprint Nextel that nothing in this decision applies to wholesale or resale tariffs. Wholesale/resale rates are to remain tariffed by URF carriers. We will address requests for reform of retail special access in the next decision in this phase.

## **5. AT&T's Advice Letters**

We will not resolve in this decision the issues raised by protests to AT&T's Advice Letters 28800 and 28982 – including whether to permit these advice letters modifying Rule 12 tariff to remain in effect.<sup>128</sup> TURN contends that evidentiary hearings are necessary to resolve issues raised by the protests to AT&T advice letters. We will address TURN's request for evidentiary hearings shortly by a separate ruling in this proceeding before issuing a decision on the remainder of the protest issues.

---

<sup>128</sup> However, given our clarification of Ordering Paragraph 21 in the URF Phase I decision, to the extent that AT&T desires on a going-forward basis to remove any remaining marketing restrictions or conditions contained in its Tariff Rule 12, we direct it to file a petition for modification of the underlying decision imposing such requirements.

TURN also argues that “the advice letter process is an inappropriate procedural vehicle to modify or eliminate the marketing disclosure requirements” that were imposed through a prior Commission decision.<sup>129</sup> Pub. Util. Code Section 1708 permits the Commission, if it has given notice and opportunity to be heard pursuant to Section 1708, to modify or alter existing decisions and orders. We have provided notice in Resolution No. L-339 and in the December 2006 Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling and Revised Scoping Memo to all interested parties (including those in the URF rulemaking and those in the consolidated complaint case C.98-04-004) that we would be addressing in Phase II the issue of whether AT&T’s advice letters could modify its Rule 12 tariff. This notice alerted interested parties that issues raised by the protests (including whether AT&T’s Rule 12 tariff may be modified) would be addressed in this proceeding. Accordingly, we may consider the issues raised by the protests in this proceeding. However, as noted, we will first address the request for evidentiary hearings by a separate ruling before we resolve the issues.

## **6. Assignment of Proceeding**

Rachelle Chong is the assigned Commissioner and Karl J. Bemesderfer and Steven Kotz are the assigned Administrative Law Judges.

## **7. Comments on Proposed Decision**

The proposed decision of Commissioner Chong in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and Rule 14.2(a) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on \_\_\_\_\_, and reply comments were filed on \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>129</sup> TURN Comments on Phase 2 at 31.

**Findings of Fact**

1. Consolidation of the URF and GO 96-B proceeding will help us to coordinate issues that overlap between the proceedings and to address questions of how or whether GO 96 procedures should relate to URF advice letters.

2. D.06-08-030 granted carriers broad pricing freedoms concerning many telecommunications services, new telecommunications products, bundles of services, promotion, and contracts. It also simplified tariff procedures and made tariffs effective one day after filing and required that all carriers provide a thirty-day notice to customers of any price increase or more restrictive term or condition.

3. On December 21, 2006, the Assigned Commissioner issued a revised Scoping Memo seeking comment on, among other things: i) the relationship between one-day effective advice letters and the notice and protest requirements of GO 96-A and the Public Utilities Code and prior Commission decisions; ii) whether to detariff telephone service other than basic exchange service; iii) clarifying the scope of the asymmetric administrative process language of Ordering Paragraph 21 of D.06-08-030; and iv) whether company-specific marketing and disclosure requirements imposed as a condition or requirement resulting from an enforcement or complaint case should be continued, or whether, in light of changed market conditions, they may be lifted through the filing of an advice letter.

4. In adopting the one-day filing procedure in D.06-08-030, we wanted to provide URF Carriers with the ability to innovate and offer new services or rates, terms, and conditions without regulatory delay.

5. There are Commission precedents for advice letters effective one day after filing. However, the precedents, in particular, Res. T-15139, do not provide

advice letter procedures that are consistent with the Commission's intent in D.06-08-030.

6. GO 96-B provides an adequate framework for URF advice letter filings and such advice letters should be filed pursuant to General Rule 7.3.3 (effective pending disposition).

7. Tier 1 under GO 96-B is well-suited to the filing of URF advice letters. Because an advice letter filed under Tier 1 may be effective immediately, Tier 1 enhances the ability of market participants to act quickly in competitive conditions.

8. Tier 1 advice letters may not be suspended. Tier 1 also provides flexibility: If the carrier so chooses, it may designate an effective date later than the filing date, or it may file the advice letter under Tier 2 (effective upon staff approval) if the carrier for whatever reason desires to have prior regulatory approval before taking a particular action.

9. If there is a protest to a Tier 1 advice letter, staff will review the issues raised by the protest. If the Commission or staff finds that the advice letter was impermissibly filed under Tier 1, the carrier may be required to withdraw the filing and take other action as the Commission may require.

10. The large local exchange carriers object to the tier structure of GO 96-B, but they have not analyzed the Commission precedents for one-day filing or recognized that Tier 1 under GO 96-B would promote streamlined regulation. They also do not offer alternative guidelines for processing the URF advice letters.

11. The competitive advantage enjoyed by VoIP and wireless carriers, who do not have to file advice letters at all, is lessened by our adoption today of Tier 1

procedure for URF advice letters, allowing them to become effective immediately. Detariffing can further offset this advantage.

12. DRA and TURN propose to apply GO 96-B procedure, in modified form, to URF advice letters. However, their proposed modifications are inconsistent with the principles and goals of URF.

13. GO 96-B recognizes the emergence of alternative regulatory approaches at this Commission, and the greater flexibility we have accorded utility management in all the regulated industries.

14. In competitive conditions, market participants must be able to act quickly. Tier 1 procedures enable them to do so because Tier 1 advice letters are effective upon filing, and because they are already in effect, they may not be suspended.

15. There is no real benefit to have a one-day delay between filing and effectiveness of an advice letter.

16. Under GO 96-B, the grounds for protest are more narrow where the Commission has determined not to regulate rates.

17. We found in Phase I of the URF proceeding that Verizon, AT&T, Frontier, and SureWest lack significant market power with respect to any retail voice communications service offered within their service territories.

18. In D.06-08-030, we found that the market for all retail voice communications services throughout the service territories of Verizon, AT&T, Frontier and SureWest is competitive and rejected evidence that market share and entity size indicate that a market is not competitive.

19. We rely on the market power findings of D.06-08-030 that the four major ILECs lack market power.

20. We adopt new rules for carriers that seek to detariff to satisfy the requirements of Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(c)(1) and (2). In particular, we

require carriers that detariff services to make available, at no cost, to the consumer information that is substantially equivalent to information previously contained in their tariffs by posting the rates, terms and conditions for detariffed services on their publicly available websites and providing a toll-free number for consumers to call to obtain a copy of rates, terms and conditions. We also require that carriers archive this information for three years, and make this archive available to the public.

21. There are existing Commission rules and safeguards (including those against cramming and slamming) in place to protect consumers against fraud. The Commission has also adopted enhanced investigation and enforcement capability in the Telecommunications Fraud Unit and a consumer fraud toll-free hotline.

22. URF Carriers lack market power and lack the ability to engage in the kind of anti-competitive behavior referenced in Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(d). We are not deregulating resale rates, and we require that URF Carriers post rates, terms, and conditions for services on their websites; thus, URF Carriers will not be able to engage in anti-competitive pricing without detection.

23. We have deregulated all but Basic Service rates, and thus eliminated the financial incentive for a licensed carrier to engage in cross-subsidization with an unlicensed affiliate.

24. Tariffs afford carriers protection under the Filed Rate Doctrine and limitation of liability provisions. Tariffs are often cumbersome, legalistic and unwieldy documents that are difficult for most consumers to read or understand.

25. It is desirable to establish detariffing procedures for URF Carriers. The Commission's existing rules together with those adopted today will provide adequate protection for consumers.

26. We do not establish mandatory detariffing procedures. Instead, we permit carriers to apply to detariff by filing Tier 2 advice letters pursuant to GO 96-B within an 18 month implementation period after the effective date of this decision.

27. If there is no protest to a Tier 2 advice letter seeking to detariff services and the advice letter is otherwise in compliance with GO 96-B and the services do not fall within the categories for which we prohibit detariffing, the advice letter is deemed approved.

28. If a Tier 2 advice letter is protested, staff will review the protest under the procedures set forth in General Rule 7.6.1 of GO 96-B. Since the grounds for protest are narrow, staff will usually be able to approve or reject the advice letter by the end of the initial 30-day review period.

29. Detariffing of basic service is not permitted under Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7.

30. Detariffing of resale service is outside the scope of this proceeding.

31. On a prospective basis, a carrier may not file an advice letter to remove a requirement or condition in its tariffs resulting from an enforcement, complaint, or merger proceeding.

32. The 911 system provides the public an important public service that must be available to all phone customers and must not be detariffed.

33. Carriers may not detariff services offered by an interexchange carrier that allows a consumer to dial around a local exchange carrier to use the services of the interexchange carrier without a contract.

34. Carriers may not detariff a service that was not granted full pricing flexibility in D.06-08-030, such as resale services.

35. Carriers may not detariff obligations pursuant to existing state or federal law, including Carrier of Last Resort obligations.

36. Any conditions or requirements imposed in a Commission decision may be lifted only by demonstrating compliance with its terms, and by a subsequent Commission decision.

37. We will address the issues raised by protests to the AT&T advice letters 28800 and 28982 after we address the request for evidentiary hearings on that issue.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. D.06-08-030 should be modified such that the URF advice letters formerly qualifying for effectiveness one day after filing must now be filed under the procedures for Tier 1 advice letters, as those procedures are set forth and explained in D.07-01-024.

2. Under GO-96-B, the grounds upon which an advice letter may be protested are limited. For example, where the Commission has granted utilities full pricing flexibility, which it has done for URF Carriers with respect to many services in D.06-08-030, an advice letter increasing a rate for one of these services may not be protested as unreasonable.

3. The competitive advantage enjoyed by VoIP and wireless carriers over carriers that file advice letters arises from federal preemption over certain aspects of VoIP and wireless service. The advantage does not result from any action taken in the URF or GO 96 rulemakings.

4. GO 96-B provides procedures that are consistent with the policies we adopted in D.06-08-030 and should govern advice letter filings under URF.

5. Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 authorizes the Commission, by rule or order, to establish procedures to detariff a service if the Commission finds that the

telephone corporation lacks significant market power for that service for which an exemption from tariffing requirements is being requested.

6. The requirements of Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7 have been met for the Commission to establish detariffing procedures.

7. Section 495.7 does not permit detariffing of basic exchange service. We interpret “basic exchange service” to mean “basic service,” as defined in D.96-10-066.

8. We rely on the record in Phase I of the URF proceeding to find that Section 495.7(b)(1) is met.

9. The Commission considered various criteria including market share, but did not rely on market share in determining that AT&T, Verizon, Frontier, and SureWest lack significant market power. Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(b)(1) does not require that the criterion of “market share” be the sole factor to consider in assessing a carrier’s market power.

10. Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(c) is met, because there are existing statutes and rules that address the safeguards that are necessary to protect consumers prior to establishing detariffing procedures.

11. We adopt new requirements for carriers seeking to detariff to satisfy Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(c), including the requirement that carriers detariffing their services must make available to the public their rates, terms, and conditions for detariffed services on their websites and provide a toll-free number for consumers to call to obtain a copy of rates, terms, and conditions.

12. General contract principles prohibit a carrier from unilaterally changing rates, terms, or conditions to a contract with a customer.

13. Carriers that enter into a term contract (with early termination fees) with a consumer for detariffed services shall not unilaterally change rates, terms, or

conditions to the term contract unless the carrier has provided the customer 30-day notice and received consumer consent for the new rates, terms, and conditions.

14. We conclude that Pub. Util. Code Section 495.7(d) is satisfied under URF. We find that URF Carriers that are incumbent local exchange carriers lack market power throughout their service territories and also lack the ability to engage in anti-competitive pricing and lack incentive to engage in cross-subsidization with an affiliate.

15. We establish permissive detariffing procedures that allow URF Carriers to detariff telephone services via Tier 2 advice letters.

16. We intend for these detariffing procedures to apply to all URF Carriers, including the four major ILECs, CLECs, and IXC.

17. It is not in the public interest for carriers to amend or lift tariffs containing conditions or requirements imposed through enforcement, complaint, or merger proceedings.

18. A carrier seeking to amend or lift a tariff containing conditions or requirements imposed as a result of a prior Commission enforcement, complaint, or merger case must file an application or petition to do so.

19. Detariffing of 911 services is not in the public interest.

20. Detariffing of dial-around services or other forms of direct connection to an interexchange carrier is not in the public interest.

21. Detariffing of obligations pursuant to existing state or federal law (such as Carrier of Last Resort obligations) is not in the public interest or lawful.

22. Detariffing of resale services or other services that were not granted full pricing flexibility in D.06-08-030 is not in the public interest.

23. Once a service is detariffed, the carrier need not file anything further with the Commission regarding the detariffed service, such as advice letters regarding rate changes or changes to terms and conditions. The carrier also does not need to file the contract for the detariffed service. The carrier must continue to notify a customer 30 days in advance of increased rates, or more restrictive terms and conditions for detariffed services and must post all available information on its website.

24. The 18 month implementation period for detariffing does not apply to the carrier's offering of new services on a detariffed basis. For example, if an URF Carrier seeks to offer new services on a detariffed basis after the 18 month implementation period, the carrier shall submit an informational filing to notify the Commission that it is offering the new service as a detariffed offering as long as the new service does not fall into the categories for which the Commission does not permit detariffing.

25. The filed rate doctrine does not apply to detariffed telephone services.

26. Detariffed telephone services are not subject to tariffed limitations of liability.

27. Ordering Paragraph 21 of D.06-08-030 was intended to permit carriers to file advice letters removing certain asymmetrical marketing, disclosure, and administrative requirements, as long as such requirements did not pertain to basic service; resale service; include requirements imposed on a carrier as a result of an enforcement, complaint, or merger proceeding; or contain obligations related to Carrier of Last Resort requirements or state or federal law.

28. As of the effective date of this decision, URF Carriers that seek to remove conditions or obligations imposed in their tariffs as a result of an enforcement,

complaint, or merger case, must file a petition or application to modify the underlying decision that imposes the conditions, obligations, or penalties.

## **O R D E R**

### **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. On or 30 days after the effective date of this decision, an URF Carrier shall file an advice letter for the following services pursuant to General Rule 7.3.3

(Tier 1 treatment) under General Order 96-B:

- a. Changes to retail service offerings other than basic service
- b. Promotional offerings, bundles, new services
- c. Withdrawal of services other than basic residential (1MR and 1 FR) and basic business (1MB) services where withdrawal of service would raise public safety issues.

2. Staff reviewing protests to Tier 1 advice letters shall notify the carrier and the Director of the Communications Division if its review will take longer than the initial 30-day period of review, and thereafter shall report on the status of the review every 30 days. The Commission shall issue a resolution to dispose of the protest no later than 150 days from the date of filing the advice letter.

3. Within the next 18 months, a carrier may detariff existing retail services and tariff sheets for those services by filing an advice letter that complies with the terms of General Order 96-B, General Rule 7.3.4, and does not purport to cancel:

- a. A tariff for basic service.
- b. A tariff that includes a requirement, condition, or obligation imposed through an enforcement, complaint, or merger proceeding.
- c. A tariff for 911 or other emergency services.

- d. A tariff relating to customer direct access to an interexchange carrier or customer choice of an interexchange carrier.
- e. A tariff for a service that was not granted full pricing flexibility in D.06-08-030 (e.g., resale services).
- f. A tariff containing obligations as a Carrier of Last Resort or other obligations under state and federal law.

4. The 18 month implementation period for detariffing does not apply to “new services” as defined in the Telecommunications Industry Rules of GO 96-B. An URF Carrier may offer new services as detariffed after the 18 month implementation period by filing an informational filing with the Commission as long as the new service does not fall into the categories of services for which we do not permit detariffing. A carrier may also offer new services as tariffed if it wishes.

5. To the extent that parties have not already done so, they may file comments without restriction as to the page or content limitations in Rule 14.3 on the following two issues.

- a. Policy issues pertaining to detariffing of retail services offered by the URF Carriers
- b. Whether the detariffing procedures established in this decision shall apply to all URF Carriers, including AT&T, Verizon, Surewest, Frontier; CLECs; and IXC, and whether these procedures thereby modify the detariffing procedures established in D.98-08-031 and other decisions for IXC services.

If parties have already commented on these issues, they should not file repetitive arguments. Notwithstanding the waiver of the page and content restrictions for these two issues, parties must comply with the page and content restrictions in their comments on the remainder of the proposed decision.

6. Today's decision shall be served on parties protesting AT&T advice letter 28800 and 28982, all parties in R.05-04-005 and R.98-07-038, and all parties in Case 98-04-004.

7. Rulemaking 98-07-038 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

**INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE**

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a Notice of Availability of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the Notice of Availability of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated July 23, 2007, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ROSCELLA GONZALEZ

Roscella Gonzalez

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

\*\*\*\*\* APPEARANCES \*\*\*\*\*

David Haddock  
Director, Regulatory  
01 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
1515 K STREET, SUITE 100  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 554-2128  
dhaddock@o1.com

R. Keenan Davis  
General Counsel  
01 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
1515 K STREET, SUITE 100  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 554-2159  
kdavis@o1.com

Mike Mulkey  
ARRIVAL COMMUNICATIONS  
1807 19TH STREET  
BAKERSFIELD CA 93301  
(661) 716-6002  
mmulkey@arrival.com

Emery G. Borsodi  
Director Rates & Reg. Relations  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET ST., RM. 1921  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1476  
emery.borsodi@att.com

Fassil T. Fenikile  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, ROOM 1925  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1455  
fassil.t.fenikile@att.com

Gregory L. Castle  
Senior Attorney  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2022  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1487  
gregory.castle@att.com

James Young  
General Attorney & Assist. General Coun  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1904  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1420

Nedya Campbell  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, 19TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1457  
nedya.campbell@att.com

Nelsonya Causby  
Attorney At Law  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET ST., STE 2025  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1488  
nelsonya.causby@att.com  
For: AT&T California

Thomas Selhorst  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, RM. 2023  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1482  
thomas.selhorst@att.com

Kim Robinson  
RICHARD H. ACKER  
Attorney At Law  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
3 EMBARCADERO CENTER, 18TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 393-2000  
krobinson@mdbe.com  
For: Greenlining Institute and Latino Issues Forum

Terry J. Houlihan  
Attorney At Law  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
3 EMBARCADERO CENTER, 18TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 393-2022  
terry.houlihan@bingham.com  
For: Greenlining Institute and Latino Issues Forum

Stephen B. Bowen  
Attorney At Law  
BOWEN LAW GROUP  
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 920  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 394-7500  
steve.bowen@bowenlawgroup.com

**\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\***

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

james.young@att.com

Gwen Johnson  
C/O AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, 18TH FLOOR, 6  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1449  
gj7927@att.com

Lesla Lehtonen  
Vp Legal And Regulatory Affairs  
CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOM ASSOCIATION  
360 22ND STREET, SUITE 750  
OAKLAND CA 94612  
(510) 628-8043 X-107  
ll@calcable.org  
For: CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOM ASSOCIATION

Maria Politzer  
CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOM ASSOCIATION  
360 22ND STREET, NO. 750  
OAKLAND CA 94612  
(510) 628-8043 126  
mp@calcable.org

Glenn Semow  
CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOMM. ASSOC.  
360 22ND STREET, STE. 750  
OAKLAND CA 94612  
(510) 628-8043  
grs@calcable.org  
For: CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOMM. ASSOC.

Sarah Deyoung  
Executive Director  
CALTEL  
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1500  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(925) 465-4396  
deyoung@caltel.org

Joseph Chicoine  
Manager, Government & External Affairs  
9260 E. STOCKTON BLVD.  
ELK GROVE CA 95624  
(916) 686-3588  
jchicoine@czn.com  
For: Citizens Telecommunications Company of California Inc.

Patrick M. Rosvall  
COOPER WHITE & COOPER, LLP  
201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 433-1900  
smalllecs@cwclaw.com  
For: Small LECs/Frontier Communications of California

E. Garth Black  
Attorney At Law  
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP  
201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 433-1900  
gblack@cwclaw.com  
For: Sure West Telephone

Esther Northrup  
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM  
5159 FEDERAL BLVD.  
SAN DIEGO CA 92105  
(619) 266-5315  
esther.northrup@cox.com  
For: COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM

Douglas Garrett  
COX COMMUNICATIONS  
2200 POWELL STREET, STE. 1035  
EMERYVILLE CA 94608  
(510) 923-6222  
douglas.garrett@cox.com

Carl K. Oshiro  
Attorney At Law  
CSBRT/CSBA  
100 PINE STREET, SUITE 3110  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 927-0158  
ckomail@pacbell.net  
For: CSBRT/CSBA

Suzanne Toller  
Attorney At Law  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6500  
suzannetoller@dwt.com  
For: Integra Telecom of California; XO Communications services,

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

Inc.

Kevin Saville  
Associate General Counsel  
CITIZENS/FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS  
2378 WILSHIRE BLVD.  
MOUND MN 55364  
(952) 491-5564  
kevin.saville@frontiercorp.com  
For: Citizens Telecommunications Company of California Inc.

Edward W. O'Neill  
Attorney At Law  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6582  
edwardoneill@dwt.com

Gregory J. Kopta  
JANE WHANG  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
1201 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 2200  
SEATTLE WA 98101-3045  
(206) 757-8079  
gregkopta@dwt.com  
For: XO Communications Services, Inc.

Melissa W. Kasnitz  
Attorney At Law  
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES  
2001 CENTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR  
BERKELEY CA 94704-1204  
(510) 665-8644  
pucservice@dralegal.org  
For: DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

Roger Heller  
Attorney At Law  
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES  
2001 CENTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR  
BERKELEY CA 94704-1204  
(510) 665-8644  
pucservice@dralegal.org  
For: DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

Charles Born  
Manager, Government & External Affairs  
FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS OF CALIFORNIA  
9260 E. STOCKTON BLVD.  
ELK GROVE CA 95624  
(916) 686-3570  
cborn@czn.com  
For: Citizens Telecommunications Company of California Inc.

Michael B. Day  
Attorney At Law  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 392-7900  
mday@gmssr.com

Thomas J. Macbride, Jr.  
Attorney At Law  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 392-7900  
tmacbride@goodinmacbride.com  
For: Califronia Association of Competitive Telecom.

Jeanne B. Armstrong  
Attorney At Law  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 392-7900  
jarmstrong@gmssr.com  
For: CTIA

Laura E. Gasser  
Legal Division  
RM. 4107  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2169  
lgx@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

Enrique Gallardo  
LATINO ISSUES FORUM  
160 PINE STREET, SUITE 700  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 547-7550  
enriqueg@lif.org  
For: The Greenlining Institute and Latino Issues Forum

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

Joseph F. Wiedman  
Attorney At Law  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 392-7900  
jwiedman@goodinmacbride.com  
For: CTIA-The Wireless Association

James E. Eggleston  
Attorney At Law  
LAW OFFICES OF JAMES EGGLESTON  
1330 BROADWAY, SUITE 1700  
OAKLAND CA 94612  
(510) 451-9500  
jojee@igc.org  
For: Telecommunications International Union (TIU)

Margaret L. Tobias  
MANDELL LAW GROUP, PC  
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SIXTH FL.  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 869-6772  
mtobias@mlawgroup.com  
For: Cox Communications

Terry L. Murray  
MURRAY & CRATTY  
8627 THORS BAY ROAD  
EL CERRITO CA 94530  
(510) 215-2860  
tlmurray@earthlink.net

Scott Cratty  
MURRAY & CRATTY, LLC  
725 VICHY HILLS DRIVE  
UKIAH CA 95482  
(707) 462-7377  
scratty@adelphia.net

Martin A. Mattes  
Attorney At Law  
NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP  
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 438-7273  
mmattes@nossaman.com  
For: California Payphone Association

Thomas J. Long  
Attorney At Law  
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY  
CITY HALL, ROOM 234

Earl Nicholas Selby  
Attorney At Law  
LAW OFFICES OF EARL NICHOLAS SELBY  
418 FLORENCE STREET  
PALO ALTO CA 94301  
(650) 323-0990  
ens@loens.com  
For: NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC./Sprint Nextel

Michael D. Sasser  
General Attorney  
PACIFIC BELL (AT&T CALIFORNIA)  
525 MARKET ST., RM. 2021  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1481  
michael.sasser@att.com  
For: Pacific Bell Telephone Company

Peter A. Casciato  
A Professional Corporation  
PETER A. CASCIATO, PC  
355 BRYANT STREET, SUITE 410  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107  
(415) 291-8661  
pcasciato@sbcglobal.net  
For: Time WarnerCable Information Services California, LLC

Colin T. Kemp  
Attorney At Law  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
50 FREMONT STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 983-1918  
ckemp@pillsburywinthrop.com

Patrick S. Thompson  
Attorney At Law  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP.  
50 FREMONT STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120-7880  
(415) 983-1000  
pthompson@pillsburywinthrop.com  
For: PACIFIC BELL

Wallace B. Roberts  
UNIT 315  
405 AVENIDA GRANADA  
SAN CLEMENTE CA 92672  
(949) 498-3456  
wally@wallyroberts.com

Richard B. Lee  
SNAVELY KING & MAJOROS O'CONNOR & LEE INC

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 554-6548  
thomas.long@sfgov.org

Colleen O'Grady Diamond  
MARY VANDERPAN  
Attorney At Law  
PACIFIC BELL  
140 NEW MONTGOMERY ST., ROOM 1510  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 542-7691  
co1864@att.com  
For: Pacific Bell

1111 14TH STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20005  
(202) 371-9151  
dlee@snavely-king.com  
For: DOD/FEA

Harry Gildea  
SNAVELY KING MAJOROS O'CONNOR & LEE INC.  
1111 14TH STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20005  
(202) 371-0604  
hgildea@snavely-king.com

Kristin L. Jacobson  
SPRINT NEXTEL  
201 MISSION STREET, SUITE 1400  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(707) 816-7583  
kristin.l.jacobson@sprint.com  
For: Sprint Nextel

Stephen H. Kukta  
Counsel  
SPRINT NEXTEL  
201 MISSION STREET, STE. 1400  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 572-8358  
stephen.h.kukta@sprint.com  
For: Sprint Nextel

Sarah E. Leeper  
STEEFEL LEVITT & WEISS PC  
1 EMBARCADERO CENTER 29TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 788-0900  
sleeper@steefel.com

Greg R. Gierczak  
Executive Director  
SURE WEST TELEPHONE  
PO BOX 969  
200 VERNON STREET  
ROSEVILLE CA 95678  
(916) 786-1440  
g.gierczak@sureswest.com

Thalia N.C. Gonzalez  
Legal Counsel  
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE  
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR  
BERKELEY CA 94704  
(510) 926-4002  
thaliag@greenlining.org  
For: THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE

Paul P. Strange  
Attorney At Law  
THE STRANGE LAW FIRM  
282 SECOND STREET, SUITE 201  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 243-3200  
strange@strangelaw.net

Erinn R.W. Putzi  
THE STRANGE LAW FIRM, PC  
282 SECOND STREET, SUITE 201  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 243-3200  
putzi@strangelaw.net  
For: SBC CALIFORNIA

Christine Mailloux  
Attorney At Law  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 929-8876  
cmailloux@turn.org  
For: TURN

Regina Costa  
Research Director  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

For: Sure West Telephone

(415) 929-8876 X312

rcosta@turn.org

For: TURN

Robert Gnaizda

Policy Director/General Counsel

THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE

1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SECOND FLOOR

BERKELEY CA 94704

(510) 926-4006

robertg@greenlining.org

For: THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE

William Nusbaum

Attorney At Law

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

(415) 929-8876

bnusbaum@turn.org

For: TURN

James M. Tobin

Esquire

TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 1800

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

(415) 268-7678

jim@tobinlaw.us

For: Pac-West Telecomm, Inc.

Don Eachus

VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.

CA501LB

112 S. LAKE LINDERO CANYON ROAD

THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362

(805) 372-7276

don.eachus@verizon.com

Laura J. Tudisco

Legal Division

RM. 5032

505 VAN NESS AVE

San Francisco CA 94102 3298

(415) 703-2164

ljt@cpuc.ca.gov

For: OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES

Natalie Wales

Legal Division

RM. 4107

505 VAN NESS AVE

San Francisco CA 94102 3298

(415) 355-5490

ndw@cpuc.ca.gov

For: DRA

Terrance A. Spann

U. S. ARMY LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY

REGULATORY LAW OFFICE JALS-RL

901 N. STUART STREET, SUITE 700

ARLINGTON VA 22203

(703) 696-2852

Terrance.Spann@hqda.army.mil

For: DOD/FEA

Rex Knowles

Regional Vice President

XO COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.

111 EAST BROADWAY, SUITE 1000

SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111

(801) 983-1504

rex.knowles@xo.com

\*\*\*\*\* STATE EMPLOYEE \*\*\*\*\*

Ann Johnson

VERIZON

HQE02F61

600 HIDDEN RIDGE

IRVING TX 75038

(972) 718-4089

ann.johnson@verizon.com

For: VERIZON

Michael C. Amato

Communications Division

RM. 3203

505 VAN NESS AVE

San Francisco CA 94102 3298

(415) 703-1863

mca@cpuc.ca.gov

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

Elaine M. Duncan  
Attorney At Law  
VERIZON  
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 300  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 474-0468  
elaine.duncan@verizon.com

Rudolph M. Reyes  
Attorney At Law  
VERIZON  
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 300  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 749-5539  
rudolph.reyes@verizon.com  
For: Verizon California Inc.

Karl Bemederfer  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 5006  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1199  
kjb@cpuc.ca.gov

Natalie Billingsley  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4108  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1368  
nxb@cpuc.ca.gov

Maribeth A. Bushey  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 5018  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-3362  
mab@cpuc.ca.gov

Helen M. Mickiewicz  
Legal Division  
RM. 5123  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1319  
hmm@cpuc.ca.gov

Charles H. Christiansen  
Communications Division  
AREA 3-D  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1901  
chc@cpuc.ca.gov

Karen P. Paull  
Legal Division  
RM. 4300  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2630  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov

Michelle Cooke  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 5108  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2637  
mlc@cpuc.ca.gov

Jacqueline A. Reed  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 5017  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2935  
jar@cpuc.ca.gov

Karin M. Hieta  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4108  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298

Rudy Sastra  
Consumer Protection & Safety Division  
AREA 2-D  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298

**\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\***

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

(415) 703-2732  
kar@cpuc.ca.gov

William Johnston  
Communications Division  
AREA 3-F  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2124  
wej@cpuc.ca.gov

Ravi Kumra  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
AREA 3-F  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2191  
rkk@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: Telecommunications Division

Simin Litkouhi  
Communications Division  
AREA 3-D  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1865  
sim@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

Timothy J. Sullivan  
Executive Division  
RM. 5212  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-5462  
tjs@cpuc.ca.gov

Lee-Whei Tan  
Communications Division  
AREA 3-C  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2901  
lwt@cpuc.ca.gov

Jane Whang  
Legal Division  
RM. 5029  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2721  
jjw@cpuc.ca.gov

(415) 703-3853  
hey@cpuc.ca.gov

James Simmons  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4108  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-3512  
jjs@cpuc.ca.gov

Richard Smith  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 5019  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1083  
rs1@cpuc.ca.gov

Michael Sukhov  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4101  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1349  
skv@cpuc.ca.gov

William H. Weber  
Attorney At Law  
CBEYOND COMMUNICATIONS  
320 INTERSTATE NORTH PARKWAY  
ATLANTA GA 30339  
(678) 370-2327  
william.weber@cbeyond.net

John R. Gutierrez  
COMCAST PHONE OF CALIFORNIA, LLC  
12647 ALCOSTA BLVD., SUITE 200  
SAN RAMON CA 94583  
(925) 973-7214  
john\_gutierrez@cable.comcast.com

Staff Counsel  
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA  
520 EL CAMINO REAL, STE 340  
SAN MATEO CA 94402  
(650) 375-7844  
lex@consumercal.org

Alexis K. Wodtke

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

Sue Wong  
Communications Division  
AREA 3-D  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2308  
skw@cpuc.ca.gov

Staff Attorney  
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA  
520 S. EL CAMINO REAL, STE. 340  
SAN MATEO CA 94402  
(650) 375-7847  
lex@consumercal.org

\*\*\*\*\* INFORMATION ONLY \*\*\*\*\*

Alexandra Hanson  
Director Provisioning  
01 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
1515 K STREET, SUITE 100  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 554-2115  
ahanson@o1.com

Katherine K. Mudge  
Attorney At Law  
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY  
7000 NORTH MOPAC EXPRESSWAY, 2ND FLOOR  
AUSTIN TX 78731  
(512) 514-6380  
katherine.mudge@covad.com

Marc D. Joseph  
Attorney At Law  
ADAMS, BROADWELL, JOSEPH & CARDOZO  
601 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 1000  
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080  
(650) 589-1660  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com

Judy Pau  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6587  
judypau@dwt.com

Katie Nelson  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6572  
katiensel@dwt.com

Treg Tremont  
Attorney At Law  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6500  
tregtremont@dwt.com

Richard H. Levin  
Attorney At Law  
6741 SEBASTOPOL AVE STE 230  
SEBASTOPOL CA 95472-3838  
(707) 523-4223  
rl@comrl.com  
For: Level 3 Communications, LLC

Shelley Bergum  
DEAF & DISABLED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRGRM  
505 14TH STREET, SUITE 400  
OAKLAND CA 94612-3532  
(510) 302-1100  
sbergum@ddtp.org

Donald H. Maynor  
Attorney At Law  
235 CATALPA DRIVE  
ATHERTON CA 94027  
(650) 327-2894  
don@uutlaw.com

Carrie Deleon  
1015 15TH STREET NW 10TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON DC 20005  
(202) 842-8926

Mary E. Wand  
Attorney At Law  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 MARKET STREET

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

carrie.deleon@wolterskluwer.com

Gregory T. Diamond  
7901 LOWRY BLVD.  
DENVER CO 80230  
(720) 670-2018  
gdiamond@covad.com

Aloa Stevens  
FRONTIER, A CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS CO.  
299 S MAIN ST STE 1700  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111-2279  
(801) 924-6356  
astevens@czn.com

Sheila Harris  
Manager, Government Affairs  
INTEGRA TELECOM HOLDINGS, INC.  
1201 NE LLOYD BLVD., STE.500  
PORTLAND OR 97232  
(503) 453-8119  
sheila.harris@integratelecom.com

Michael R. Romano  
Attorney At Law  
LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC  
2300 CORPORATE PARK DR. STE 600  
HERNDON VA 20171-4845  
(720) 888-7015  
Mike.Romano@Level3.com

Allen K. Trial  
Counsel  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
101 ASH STREET, HQ-12D  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 699-5162  
atrial@sempira.com

Jennifer Files  
Telecommunications Reporter  
SAN JOSE MERCURY NEWS  
750 RIDDERPARK DRIVE  
SAN JOSE CA 95190  
(408) 920-5026

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 268-7000  
mwand@mofo.com

Vince Vasquez  
Senior Fellow, Technology Studies  
PACIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
755 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 450  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
vvasquez@pacificresearch.org

Jeff Wirtzfeld  
Regulatory Contact  
QWEST COMMUNICATION CORPORATION  
1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 4700  
DENVER CO 80202  
(303) 896-5959  
jeff.wirtzfeld@qwest.com

Adam L. Sherr  
Attorney At Law  
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION  
1600 7TH AVENUE, 3206  
SEATTLE WA 98191-0000  
(206) 398-2507  
Adam.Sherr@qwest.com

Marjorie O. Herlth  
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION  
1801 CALIFORNIA ST., SUITE 4700  
DENVER CO 80202  
(303) 965-2287  
marjorie.herlth@qwest.com

Michael Shames  
Attorney At Law  
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK  
3100 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE B  
SAN DIEGO CA 92103  
(619) 696-6966  
mshames@ucan.org

Carl C. Lower  
UTILITY SPECIALISTS  
717 LAW STREET  
SAN DIEGO CA 92109-2436  
(619) 987-0355  
clower@earthlink.net

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

**Last Update on 23-JUL-2007 by: LIL  
R0504005 NOPOST4  
R9807038,C9804004**

jfiles@simercury.com

Allen S. Hammond, Iv  
Professor Of Law  
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SHCOOL OF LAW  
500 EL CAMINO REAL  
SANTA CLARA CA 94305  
(408) 554-4078  
ahammond@usc.ed  
For: The BroadBand Institute of California

Mark Lyons  
SIMPSON PARTNERS LLP  
SUITE 1800  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 732-1701  
marklegal@sbcglobal.net

Anita C. Taff-Rice  
Attorney At Law  
1547 PALOS VERDES MALL, SUITE 298  
WALNUT CREEK CA 94597  
(415) 699-7885  
anitataffrice@earthlink.net

Marilyn H. Ash  
U.S. TELEPACIFIC CORP.  
620/630 3RD ST.  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107  
(510) 995-5600  
ashm@telepacific.com

Nancy E. Lubamersky  
Vice President  
U.S. TELEPACIFIC CORP.  
620/630 3RD ST.  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107  
(510) 995-5602  
nlubamersky@telepacific.com

Lupita Reyes  
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.  
MAIL CODE HQE02F69  
600 HIDDEN RIDGE  
IRVING TX 75038  
(972) 718-6744  
lupita.reyes@verizon.com

Leon M. Bloomfield  
Attorney At Law  
WILSON & BLOOMFIELD, LLP  
1901 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1620  
OAKLAND CA 94612  
(510) 625-1164  
lmb@wblaw.net